

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, May 2, 1989

The House met at 12 noon.

The Reverend Dr. Ronald F. Christian, assistant to the bishop, Washington, DC, Metro Synod, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, offered the following prayer:

The eyes of all look to You, O God, and You give them their meat in due season. You open Your hand and satisfy the desire of every living thing.

And so, O God, we are bold to open our hands and hearts this day to pray for: Joy in our living; satisfaction in our working; peace in our relationships; and patience in our trials.

Give to us, we pray, everything that we need for our daily lives, and save us from the yearning of selfish want.

Then we shall be satisfied and offer our thanks to You, O God, our Creator. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 290, nays 102, not voting 41, as follows:

(Roll No. 36)

YEAS—290

Ackerman	Bevill	Campbell (CA)
Akaka	Bilbray	Campbell (CO)
Alexander	Boggs	Cardin
Anderson	Bonior	Carper
Andrews	Borski	Chapman
Annunzio	Bosco	Clarke
Anthony	Boucher	Clement
Applegate	Boxer	Coelho
Archer	Brennan	Coleman (TX)
Aspin	Brooks	Collins
Atkins	Broomfield	Combest
AuCoin	Browder	Conte
Barnard	Brown (CA)	Conyers
Bartlett	Bruce	Cooper
Bates	Bryant	Costello
Beilenson	Bustamante	Coyne
Bennett	Byron	Crockett
Bereuter	Callahan	Darden

Davis	Kasich	Price
de la Garza	Kastenmeier	Quillen
DeFazio	Kennedy	Rahall
Dellums	Kennelly	Rangel
Derrick	Kildee	Ravenel
Dicks	Kliczka	Ray
Dingell	Kolter	Regula
Donnelly	Kostmayer	Richardson
Dorgan (ND)	LaFalce	Rinaldo
Downey	Lancaster	Robinson
Dreier	Lantos	Roe
Duncan	Laughlin	Rohrabacher
Durbin	Leath (TX)	Rose
Dwyer	Lehman (CA)	Rostenkowski
Dymally	Lehman (FL)	Rowland (CT)
Dyson	Leland	Rowland (GA)
Early	Lent	Russo
Eckart	Levin (MI)	Sabo
Edwards (CA)	Levine (CA)	Saiki
Edwards (OK)	Lewis (GA)	Sangmeister
English	Lipinski	Sarpalius
Erdreich	Livingston	Savage
Evans	Long	Sawyer
Fascell	Lowey (NY)	Saxton
Fazio	Luken, Thomas	Scheuer
Fish	Markay	Schiff
Flake	Martinez	Schneider
Flippo	Matsui	Schulze
Foglietta	Mazzoli	Schumer
Foley	McCloskey	Sharp
Ford (MI)	McCrery	Shaw
Ford (TN)	McCurdy	Shumway
Frank	McDermott	Shuster
Frenzel	McHugh	Siskis
Frost	McMillen (MD)	Skaggs
Gallo	McNulty	Skeen
Garcia	Meyers	Skelton
Gaydos	Mfume	Slattery
Gejdenson	Miller (CA)	Smith (FL)
Gephardt	Miller (WA)	Smith (IA)
Gibbons	Mineta	Smith (MS)
Gillmor	Moakley	Smith (NE)
Gilman	Mollohan	Smith (NJ)
Gingrich	Montgomery	Smith (VT)
Glickman	Moody	Solarz
Gonzalez	Morella	Spence
Gordon	Morrison (WA)	Spratt
Gradison	Mrazek	Stallings
Grant	Murtha	Stark
Gray	Myers	Stenholm
Guarini	Nagle	Stokes
Hall (OH)	Natcher	Studds
Hall (TX)	Neal (MA)	Synar
Hamilton	Neal (NC)	Tallon
Hammerschmidt	Nelson	Tanner
Harris	Nielson	Tauzin
Hatcher	Nowak	Thomas (GA)
Hawkins	Oakar	Torres
Hayes (IL)	Oberstar	Traficant
Hayes (LA)	Obey	Traxler
Hefner	Olin	Udall
Hertel	Ortiz	Unsoeld
Hoagland	Owens (NY)	Valentine
Hopkins	Owens (UT)	Vander Jagt
Horton	Packard	Vento
Houghton	Pallone	Visclosky
Hoyer	Panetta	Volkmer
Hubbard	Parker	Walgren
Hughes	Parris	Watkins
Hutto	Patterson	Waxman
Jenkins	Payne (NJ)	Weiss
Johnson (CT)	Payne (VA)	Whitten
Johnson (SD)	Pease	Wilson
Johnston	Pelosi	Wise
Jones (GA)	Penny	Wolpe
Jones (NC)	Perkins	Wyden
Jontz	Pickett	Wyllie
Kanjorski	Pickle	Yatron
Kaptur	Poshard	

NAYS—102

Armey	Bliley	Chandler
Baker	Boehlert	Clay
Ballenger	Brown (CO)	Clinger
Barton	Buechner	Coble
Bentley	Bunning	Coleman (MO)
Bilirakis	Burton	Cox

Craig	Leach (IA)	Roukema
Crane	Lewis (CA)	Schroeder
Dannemeyer	Lewis (FL)	Schuetz
DeLay	Lightfoot	Sensenbrenner
DeWine	Lowery (CA)	Shays
Dickinson	Lukens, Donald	Sikorski
Dornan (CA)	Machtley	Slaughter (VA)
Douglas	Madigan	Smith, Denny
Emerson	Marlenee	(OR)
Gallegly	McCandless	Smith, Robert
Gekas	McDade	(NH)
Goodling	McEwen	Smith, Robert
Goss	McGrath	(OR)
Grandy	McMillan (NC)	Snowe
Hansen	Michel	Solomon
Hastert	Miller (OH)	Stangeland
Hefley	Molinari	Stearns
Henry	Moorhead	Stump
Herger	Murphy	Sundquist
Hiler	Oxley	Thomas (CA)
Holloway	Pashayan	Upton
Hunter	Paxon	Vucanovich
Hyde	Petri	Walker
Ireland	Porter	Walsh
Jacobs	Rhodes	Weber
James	Ridge	Wheat
Kolbe	Roberts	Whittaker
Kyl	Rogers	Wolf
Lagomarsino	Roth	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—41

Bateman	Hancock	Roybal
Berman	Hochbrueckner	Schaefer
Carr	Huckaby	Slaughter (NY)
Coughlin	Inhofe	Smith (TX)
Courter	Lloyd	Staggers
Dixon	Manton	Swift
Engel	Martin (IL)	Tauke
Espy	Martin (NY)	Torricelli
Fawell	Mavroules	Towns
Feighan	McCollum	Weldon
Fields	Morrison (CT)	Williams
Florio	Pepper	Yates
Green	Pursell	Young (FL)
Gunderson	Ritter	

□ 1221

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. McNULTY] come forward and lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance?

Mr. McNULTY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC, May 2, 1989.

HON. JIM WRIGHT,  
The Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a copy of the unofficial

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

results received from Kathy Karpan, Secretary of State, State of Wyoming stating that, according to the unofficial returns of the Special Election held on April 26, 1989, the Honorable Craig Thomas was elected to the Office of Representative in Congress, At-Large from the State of Wyoming.

With great respect, I am,

Sincerely yours,

DONNOLD K. ANDERSON,  
Clerk, House of Representatives.

STATE OF WYOMING,  
Cheyenne, WY, April 28, 1989.

Mr. DONNOLD K. ANDERSON,  
Clerk of the House of Representatives, The  
Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: I write to inform you about the special Congressional Election held in Wyoming on April 26, 1989.

President George Bush nominated Wyoming Congressman Richard B. Cheney to be the Secretary of Defense on March 10th. Mr. Cheney was subsequently confirmed by the United States Senate. Upon his confirmation, Mr. Cheney resigned his Congressional seat on March 17th. On March 17th, Governor Mike Sullivan declared the vacancy and issued the Writ of Election, pursuant to W.S. 1977 22-18-104. Governor Sullivan set April 26th as the election date.

The election was held on April 26, 1989. The unofficial results are enclosed herein. As one can glean from the election results, the unofficial margin of victory for Craig Thomas is 13,438. As of April 24th, there were 926 overseas ballots outstanding. Pursuant to a federal court order by Judge Clarence Brimmer, any overseas ballots received by state and county election officials shall be counted up to the close of business on May 8th. Since the unofficial margin is so great, it does not appear that the overseas ballots yet to be counted shall affect the apparent victory of Mr. Thomas.

The State Canvassing Board of the State of Wyoming shall meet on May 10, 1989, to canvass and officially declare the April 26th election results. In every possible likelihood, the Certificate of Election shall be issued to Mr. Thomas.

If you require anything further of me, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours,

KATHY KARPAN,  
Secretary of State.

#### HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW AND THURSDAY NEXT

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon tomorrow, Wednesday, May 3, 1989, and that when the House adjourns on Wednesday, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Thursday, May 4, 1989.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 106, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEAR 1990

Mr. PANETTA, from Committee on the Budget, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 101-42) on the Con-

current Resolution (H. Con. Res. 106) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1990, 1991, and 1992, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS TO SIT TODAY DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs be permitted to sit for the consideration of H.R. 1278 while the House is sitting for amendment under the 5-minute rule today.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the request has been cleared with the minority.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have to tell the gentleman that the gentleman from Illinois was not apprised of the fact that that kind of a request was coming. I do not see our ranking member of the committee here, and I would like to check with him first before consenting to the request.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, let me assure him that we were under the impression the minority had cleared the request. The ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WYLIE], certainly has cleared it, and I thought that had been conveyed to the leadership on the floor.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that the gentleman withhold that unanimous-consent request so that we may make the proper inquiry at a later time?

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. The request is withdrawn.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON A RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 106, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEAR 1990

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules be permitted to have until midnight, tonight, to file a privileged report on a resolution providing for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 106) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal

years 1990, 1991, and 1992, which was just filed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE CRAIG THOMAS OF WYOMING AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wyoming, Mr. CRAIG THOMAS, be permitted to take the oath of office today. His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations. You are now a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS TO SIT TODAY DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the request I made earlier has been cleared with the minority leader, and, therefore, I make the same unanimous-consent request, that the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs be permitted to sit for the consideration of H.R. 1278 while the House is sitting for amendment under the 5-minute rule today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION BY NEWLY ELECTED MEMBER

(Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to thank the ladies and gentlemen for gathering here, and I simply want to tell them that the opportunity to represent the State of Wyoming in the U.S. Congress is the greatest privilege of my life, and I am looking forward to working with each of you and representing the good folks of Wyoming. Thank you so very much.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without



amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 50. Concurrent resolution permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to commemorate the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 774. An act to reform, recapitalize, and consolidate the Federal deposit insurance system, to enhance the regulatory and enforcement powers of Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 1295(b), title 46, of the United States Code, the Chair on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Mr. BREAUX from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, and Mr. HOLLINGS from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, ex officio, to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 100-696, the chair on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints Mr. MOYNIHAN and Mr. REID, to the U.S. Capitol Preservation Commission.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 100-690, the chair, on behalf of the majority leader, announces the appointment of Mr. SHELBY and Mr. GRAHAM, to the National Commission on Drug-Free Schools.

#### ADDRESSING THE DRUG "DEMAND" PROBLEM

(Mr. McNULTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, every day we hear a great deal of rhetoric about our Nation's drug problem. But, most of the focus up until now has been on curbing the flow of illegal drugs into the United States—the so-called supply problems. We need to turn our attention in a meaningful way to addressing the tremendous demand which exists for drugs in our society. The cost to society, Mr. Speaker, is enormous. Prior to coming to Congress I served as chairman of the New York State Assembly Subcommittee on Alcoholism in Corrections. I toured many of New York's facilities, and was shocked to learn that more than 70 percent of the inmates in our State's facilities were there because they had serious problems with alcohol or other drugs.

Mr. Speaker, let me give you an example of what that is costing society. In New York, new jail construction is costing approximately \$100,000 per cell. On top of that, it costs an additional \$25,000 per inmate every year to

keep them incarcerated. I can only begin to wonder how much we could save if we made the minimal investments in education, prevention, and treatment programs which are necessary in order to prevent the disease of addiction from sending so many of our young people to prison.

Mr. Speaker, as the man on the commercial says, you can pay me now, or you can pay me later. I submit to you and my colleagues that the cost of waiting—and not making these investments—is more than the American people can afford.

#### REOPEN THE CATASTROPHIC CARE LEGISLATION

(Mr. SAXTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that millions of older Americans were cheering when this House voted unanimously to direct the Senate Finance Committee to reopen the catastrophic care law we passed last year.

Today, I rise to encourage leadership in this body to move forward with similar action on the House side.

Ever since we took that fateful vote last year, I have been meeting with senior citizen groups. I have heard their concerns.

And believe me, both their concerns, and questions, have been many.

In an effort to get a clear consensus of opinion, I decided to conduct a poll on the catastrophic coverage law.

It was only a week or so ago that the survey arrived at most homes. Yet today, I can report that thousands of responses—just like these—are pouring into my office.

I even had an individual from another congressional district call up and ask if I had an extra 1,000 copies of the survey that she could circulate.

Drastic changes need to be made in the law and 96 percent of those who responded indicated that: when older Americans talk, this Congressman listens. And so should all of Congress.

I say we get to work, straighten out the finance provisions, and give seniors the piece of mind they deserve.

#### LET JAPAN BUY OUR PLANES OR MAKE ITS OWN

(Mr. SANGMEISTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SANGMEISTER. Mr. Speaker, apparently this administration still believes that the right approach to good relations with our ally Japan is to continue to give them our little remaining technology. We are giving the Japanese our technology so that they can manufacture the FSX, an advanced

version of the F-16. This is wrong and indefensible.

Japan is already at least 25 years late in accepting the responsibility to defend its own borders and now wants to make sure its committed tax dollars remain in their country. We certainly should learn something from that attitude.

The administration says that Japan promises to carefully guard all technology given them. If anyone believes this they have forgotten the lesson of just a year ago when Toshiba Corp. took our technology and sold it to the Soviet Union. We got an awful lot of apology for that and I am sure they are willing to give us a lot more.

Unfortunately, this country doesn't lead the commercial world anymore, however, we still lead in aviation, at least we will until this deal is cut. Boeing, McDonald Douglas, and others may be doing well now, but wait until we help set up Japan in this operation—goodbye jobs—goodbye technology—hello further trade deficit.

The Congress should overwhelmingly defeat this agreement. Japan should be buying our planes made by our American workmen. That is the least it owes us. If not, let them make their own.

#### OPPOSITION TO FSX FIGHTER DEAL

(Mrs. ROUKEMA asked and was given permission to address the House 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I was most disturbed by President Bush's decision to proceed with the FSX jet fighter program. Today, I am cosponsoring the resolution of disapproval.

In my view, this is the wrong decision and represents bad policy. The original concept for this deal was faulty and totally unnecessary. The revised proposal provides little consolation.

Make no mistake about this deal. This is an outright technology transfer of major proportions which will have profound economic and technological consequences for this Nation. The end result of this can only be a Japanese commercial and defense aircraft industry which will rival our own and threaten American jobs, not create them. It is incredible to me that the administration can even suggest that this represents a job creation bill.

Regrettably, the specific details of this proposal have remained either vague or classified. We do not know exactly what we are getting. But we do know a great deal about what we are giving away. The Congress must vote this deal down.

A foreign policy which reinforces United States-Japanese relations is im-

portant. But not at the expense of our advanced technology, our industrial base, and certainly not driven but the internal political demands of the beneficiary.

#### TWO TOYOTAS IN EVERY GARAGE

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, Japan should be buying our fighter planes. President Bush should not be giving them that technology.

Mr. Speaker, it is not enough that Japan already has our Pentagon handcuffed with cheap steel and microchips. Evidently, the President will not be satisfied until there are two Toyotas in every garage in the United States, and I do not think he will even stop then. He will probably invite Mutual of Tokyo over so they can write the insurance on those Toyotas.

Mr. Speaker, I say let us vote this misdirected policy down. It is time to stop the giveaways to not only Japan, but to everyone. The welfare program we have in this country needs tailoring, but for America, not for Japan and other countries.

#### LEGISLATION TO EXTEND THE TIME FOR VETERANS TO MAKE USE OF THEIR GI EDUCATION BENEFITS

(Mr. RHODES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to extend by 3½ years the December 31, 1989, deadline for veterans to fully use the GI bill benefits originally granted to them in 1955. Many veterans now threatened with the cutoff of such benefits and unable to qualify for assistance under the new Montgomery GI bill still have earned benefits of which they will be denied use. Many will be actively pursuing their education at the end of this year.

We must keep our pledge to help provide veterans with the assistance they need to afford higher education upon leaving the service of their country. This body must not deny to those seeking such necessary skills the funds needed to help pay for them.

Mr. Speaker, this bill merely authorizes an extended period of time of up to 5 years for those veterans given less than the traditional 10 years from time of discharge to use their accrued benefits. Veterans who have served this Nation, been discharged honorably, and now seek education must not be turned away. The most expensive action this body can take is to renege on its commitment to education.

Sooner or later, society must pay for those without the skills to survive a changing work environment. The veterans of this Nation deserve our support, and they deserve the opportunity to fully exercise the educational benefits they were promised and have earned with their service to America.

I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation.

#### INTRODUCTION OF COMPREHENSIVE CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM BILL

(Mr. PEASE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing my own comprehensive campaign finance reform bill. It is clearly not the first of its kind, nor will it be the last.

Congressional service is becoming a "rich man's game." Many qualified individuals decide not to seek office because of the costs involved, and officials in office are hampered in their performance because fundraising is now a constant concern. It's time to clean up our campaign finance system once and for all.

My package includes some good ideas introduced previously as well as some original ideas of my own.

Briefly, the legislation provides significant incentives for House candidates to accept spending limitations. These incentives include reduced advertising rates as well as full tax credits for individual contributors in one's district.

You will also find in my bill several provisions affecting the ways in which PAC's can make donations to candidates. If my bill is enacted, PAC's will only be allowed to make contributions to one candidate per race; they will only be allowed to make contributions in election years; contributors to PAC's will have the opportunity to designate to whom they wish their money to go; and PAC's will be prevented from making contributions to candidates whose campaign treasuries already exceed \$100,000.

Mr. Speaker, this is just a brief summary of some of the provisions included in the bill. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this very important campaign finance reform bill.

#### SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Kalbaugh, one of his secretaries.

□ 1240

#### EXXON'S DONATION OF CRUDE OIL TO ALASKAN WILDERNESS

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, when Americans give, they give generously. Take Exxon. One month ago, the company donated 11 million gallons of crude oil to the Alaskan wilderness. And now Exxon is asking American consumers to reach deep into their pockets and give generously at the gas pump. Mr. Speaker, we can do without that kind of charity.

What is the real reason for the surge in gas prices? I am waiting for an adequate explanation. The last time this happened, it took a full-blown OPEC boycott to do it.

It is not Alaska—that disruption amounted to about 17 hours of national consumption, and recent disruptions in the North Sea haven't amounted to a drop in the tank of U.S. supply.

The costs of Exxon's negligence are being borne by consumers, not by sheiks, and oil barons, and fat cats. Alaskans are getting reimbursed for their losses. Perhaps Exxon should reimburse the Nation's drivers for theirs.

The American public demands answers. And if the oil companies are not willing to supply them, then this Congress better be prepared to roll up its sleeves and take a good, hard look under the hood.

#### LEGISLATION TO RESTORE DISCIPLINE TO THE BUDGET PROCESS

(Mr. BUECHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to restore a semblance of discipline to a budget process that is clearly out of control. My bill would amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the Rules of the House of Representatives to require long-term cost estimates to accompany all legislation.

Paul Greenberg once observed that Congress has perfected a crowd-pleasing racket of supporting every spending program, denouncing every annual deficit, hoping the electorate won't note the obvious connection, and leading the country over a fiscal cliff. Certainly, this is no way to conduct the Nation's business.

In 1988 alone Congress proposed over 12 new spending programs. The initial cost of these programs was small. However, the 5-year cost exceeded \$100 billion. We do not even know how much these programs will cost over 10 years. Certainly, this is



both irresponsible and unfair to the people in this country who must pay the bills.

My bill will require the Congressional Budget Office to provide a 10-year cost impact statement for all spending programs. This will give the American people insight into the long-term costs of spending commitments. It will allow them to judge whether the stated benefits of proposed legislation justify the estimated costs. Furthermore, it will prevent Congress from hastily enacting long-term budget busters without fully considering the fiscal implications of our actions.

This legislation is long overdue, and I invite each of you to join me as a cosponsor.

#### FSX RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL

(Mr. LEVINE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, with a bipartisan group of cosponsors, a resolution of disapproval of the proposal to license F-16 technology to Japan for the development of a new Japanese fighter plane, the FSX. I am pleased that 30 of my colleagues are joining me as original cosponsors of this joint resolution.

Despite the Bush administration's partial renegotiation of this deal, it is still a bad deal for the United States. It will hurt our national competitiveness in aerospace. It will worsen our massive trade deficit in the long run. It will not improve United States-Japanese relations. And it is not by any means the best way of modernizing the Japanese Air Force.

Mr. Speaker, this deal is bad for America.

First, it contravenes the free trade principles that Japan professes to accept. Our F-16 is the best product at the best price, and the Japanese should buy it.

Second, it is in the interest of both Japan and America to reduce our nearly \$60 billion trade deficit.

Third, although I expect the United States to maintain its edge in aerospace technology, this proposal will hasten the day that Japan becomes a major competitor to the United States in a variety of aerospace products.

Finally, I continue to have grave concerns over the wisdom of rewarding Mitsubishi with such a codevelopment deal while questions remain over Mitsubishi's involvement in the production of chemical weapons in Libya. We have not received clear answers on this issue, and there is reason for all Americans to have continuing reservations about concluding a sensitive defense codevelopment project with a

company that may be helping Qadhafi build chemical weapons.

This is a national security issue which goes beyond partisanship and I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in vetoing this proposal.

#### FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1989

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the answer to this country's crime problem is crime control, not gun control.

Last week, I introduced the Federal Prison System Improvement Act of 1989, which seeks to address the less glamorous and largely ignored issue of prison confinement.

The Federal prison system inmate population is currently 50 percent over capacity.

Americans, and the criminals themselves, know that the chances of actually doing time are 1 in 1,000 for every felony committed. Criminals know that crime pays, and we know that the American public picks up the tab.

My bill is simple in concept. It directs the administration to develop a plan to reduce overcrowding and to house criminals convicted of Federal crimes in "emergency confinement facilities" if necessary. No longer will the length of prison confinement be influenced by available space.

Action is needed, and needed now. This legislation takes the first step toward insuring that criminals become a casualty when a violent crime is committed, and that is why I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2110, the Federal Prison System Improvement Act of 1989.

#### JOIN IN DISAPPROVING FSX AGREEMENT WITH JAPAN

(Mr. MINETA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join the resolution disapproving the FSX agreement with Japan.

The Bush administration defends the FSX deal with so-called side letters guaranteeing the United States a 40-percent share of the FSX production work. But even if we thought it a good idea to trade our best technology for the promise of jobs—and it's not—Japan's track record on agreements like this offers anything but confidence.

When our semiconductor agreement was signed with Japan, there were also side letter guarantees. But today, the United States still struggles with a paltry 10 percent of the Japanese

market—not the 20 percent we're due—and the Japanese practically deny that the letters ever existed.

Mr. Speaker, these side letters have been nothing more than a sideshow in the past, and there is no reason to believe that this history will change as a result of the FSX deal. I urge my colleagues to join the resolution of disapproval.

#### IMPROVED RELATIONS WITH MEXICO ON DRUG PROBLEM

(Mr. DREIER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, under the very able leadership of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. KIKI DE LA GARZA, last weekend we held the 29th meeting of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference. Throughout this decade I have been privileged to serve as a member of that delegation, but I have to say that the weekend meeting that we just completed has to go down as one of the most successful.

I say that because for the first time we have seriously seen the Mexicans turn the corner on this devastating drug problem which we face in this country and around the world. Just last month the leading drug kingpin in Mexico, Felix Giordo, was arrested.

We have seen under the office of the attorney general in Mexico 1,000 new people assigned to deal with the drug trafficking issue, and for the first time we are seeing law enforcement officials who have been on the take actually arrested.

I would like to compliment the chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] and all the Members of this delegation. As we continue with this issue, we will have a special order to talk more in depth about it.

□ 1250

#### CONSTITUTION COMPETITION—ENID HIGH SCHOOL

(Mr. ENGLISH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a group of 17 high school students from Enid, OK, who are in Washington this week to participate in the final round of the National Bicentennial Competition on the Constitution and Bill of Rights.

These students, who I will be meeting with later today, have prepared long and hard for this national contest. In that sense, Mr. Speaker, they are already winners. They have undergone a rigorous program of constitutional study, learning in this past year

the tenets of our system of Government and the values they embody.

In this classroom study, and in the local and State competitions they conquered on their way to Washington, these students have gained superb insights into what makes the world's greatest democracy tick.

I wish them the very best of luck as they match wits with other bright scholars from around the country. They have already made Enid and the State of Oklahoma proud, Mr. Speaker, and win or lose this week, they will return home as "real champions."

A great many people have contributed to the success of this effort, and I want to commend some of them here: president of the school board Dr. John Ireland; school district superintendent Dr. Kem Keithley; Enid High School principal Dennis Iselin; history teacher Cheryl Franklin; State competition coordinator Rita Geiger; district coordinator Mary Lou Divilbiss; and the students, David Austin, Shel Bailey, Sahil Bakshi, Jennifer Boots, Carol Bradley, Kristen Campbell, Brian Dyson, Meagan Ford, Bryan Gibbs, Daniel Goscha, Jay Marshall, Scott Meadows, Stephen Perigo, Andreas Pitsiri, Lesa Rogers, Shannon Vater, and Matt Ylitalo.

#### PAUL HARVEY CALLS FOR MFJ RELIEF

(Mr. HASTERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, on January 28, 1989, Chicago's own, Paul Harvey, in his weekly Saturday radio broadcast, accurately described the history of the postdivestiture telecommunications system in America. Citing the lack of competitiveness of American industries as evidenced by the burgeoning telecommunications trade deficit as well as the need for the Bell companies to provide electronic yellow pages, Paul Harvey was right on the mark, as usual.

In the 100th Congress, 205 Members of Congress, including myself, cosponsored House Concurrent Resolution 339, expressing the sense-of-the-House that MFJ relief in the areas of manufacturing and information services should be accorded the regional Bell Companies.

As Paul Harvey said in the conclusion of his broadcast, " \* \* \* the Bell Companies are not asking for the return to monopoly, just a chance to be fairly competitive in the American marketplace, so that America can again compete with the world."

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I insert his entire statement in the RECORD:

It was a hostile takeover any way you look at it, when the Bell Telephone system, which had served so well so long, was taken

over by government, which then kicked its assets out, in effect orphaned Ma Bell's several Baby Bells, telling them to fend for themselves. But in the American tradition, the healthy little offspring picked themselves up and dusted themselves off and continued to serve the public interest and to profit and prosper.

Despite a host of fledgling competitors with alien-sounding names, the Baby Bells survived and thrived. But added to that TKO five years ago was a low blow. The unelected federal judge arbitrarily decreed that Bell Companies could not manufacture telecommunications equipment, could not provide information services.

Well, look what's happened since. As recently as 1982, our nation was still the world leader with a telecommunications trade surplus of five hundred and eighty million dollars. But ever since that intemperate court decision, we have fallen behind, until now our nation has a telecommunications trade deficit of two point five billion.

While the Japanese, unfettered by Judge Harold Green's decision, the Japanese are helping other corporations do what Bell is prohibited from doing. So Hong Kong and Singapore are becoming hubs of the world telecommunications industry, siphoning long distance traffic away from the USA. The French are now ahead of us. The French are ahead of us, and the Spanish are about to be in the research and development which our Bell Companies are denied by court-imposed restrictions.

William Weiss was forty years with Bell. He's now Chairman of Ameritech. He's pleading with the new Congress to unshackle our state-side industry. Resolution 339 before the previous Congress would have accomplished that objective, but now that's expired. The new Congress must be made to realize that information is the lifeblood of contemporary commerce and industry. And one of the things that Bell Companies could be providing you right now is electronic yellow pages.

For public and private advertisers, especially for small businesses, an infinitely more effective technology than the cumbersome, antiquated telephone directory. But you can bet that the publishers of telephone directories are not going to encourage, or even allow if they can help it, this newer technology. Though it is already available in half a dozen other countries, and similarly restrictions on manufacturing by Bell have resulted in most all telephone sets. Listen to this. Most all telephone sets now sold in the United States are being made outside the United States. That's intolerable.

Half of all customer premises switching equipment, now sold in the United States, is manufactured outside the United States. That's shameful. Now the Bell Companies are not asking for the return to monopoly, just for a chance to be fairly competitive in the American marketplace, so that America can again compete with the world.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUS USED TO SHOW REDUCED BUDGET DEFICIT

(Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, President Bush keeps talking about a thousand points of light. I

would like to see if we could shine that thousand points of light in one spot, on the budget agreement he made with Congress.

Mr. Speaker, \$68 billion, that is the amount of money taken from the working folks, \$68 billion in Social Security surplus this year, taken from the folks who work, and it is supposed to be put in a dedicated trust fund to save for the future.

Does anyone know what they do with it? Gramm-Rudman fuses it to use to reduce the Federal budget deficit, and that is dishonest budgeting. They take money from the working folks, say that we are going to put it into a Social Security account, but, in fact, use it to reduce the deficit.

Tomorrow I am hoping we can get an amendment on the floor, a sense of Congress, that says that this is nuts and it is time to stop. Honest budgeting; it is time for us to face these problems, not to take money called Social Security that ought to go into a trust fund and use it to play a little game with the budget deficit.

Mr. Speaker, President Reagan, when he left town, said that things are getting better, the budget is going down, the budget deficit is being reduced. It is not. Things are getting worse. They are just using Social Security surplus to show a reduced budget deficit. The fact is the budget deficit is growing, and this Congress and this President had better stand up and do something about it and soon.

#### GUN CONTROL

(Mr. DELAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, once again, the U.S. Congress is being overtaken with that peculiar hysteria which guides so many of the decisions around here. Due to a few well publicized shootings involving assault weapons, we have once again decided to "shoot from the hip" at a solution of more gun control that will make some of us feel better but have no effect on crime.

In dealing with issues of public policy and crime, the goal of legal remedies should be to reduce as many rights of the criminal as necessary to reduce the crime while reducing as few rights as necessary of the law abiding public. Gun control incorporates the worst of both worlds. Gun control restricts the rights of the millions of law abiding citizens who use firearms legally and does little if anything to prevent criminals from using them illegally.

The answer to crime and guns is instantaneous electronic background checks at the time of gun purchase, as we now do with credit card purchases,



to target convicted felons and drug dealers. The American public is already the victim of crime. Let us not make them the victim of congressional hysteria as well.

#### NEPAL NEEDS A HELPING HAND

(Mr. DURBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation of Nepal is a very small country of 16 million people. It is the sixth poorest nation in the world. It is landlocked and isolated. Its neighbor to the south is India.

Several weeks ago, when these two countries could not reach an agreement on a trade treaty, India responded by closing 13 of the 15 border crossings between India and Nepal. As a result, there has been a serious shortage of vital supplies into Nepal. Without petroleum and kerosene, they have been forced to cut down trees, one of the worst environmental developments in that part of the world.

They have also had to close businesses. They have had to suspend medical care. They have had to postpone surgeries. They have had to delay the development projects which feed some of the poorest people in the world.

This trade dispute has resulted in serious deprivations in the nation of Nepal. This trade dispute, as unfortunate as it is, is not as tragic as the consequences of India's decision to close their border crossings. For the sake of the helpless victims of Nepal, this policy must come to an end and negotiations must commence immediately.

#### MR. GORBACHEV HAS A VERY DIFFICULT, TOUGH POLITICAL CAUCUS TO KEEP HAPPY

(Mr. MARTIN of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 days there has been a great deal of publicity concerning some comments Secretary Cheney had made concerning the probability of success of Mr. Gorbachev in reforming the Soviet Government, and for whatever reason, both Mr. Cheney and the President have been criticized for not speaking with one voice.

Mr. Speaker, honestly I do not understand that criticism. Obviously Secretary Cheney and the President of the United States wish Mr. Gorbachev every success. Unfortunately, wishing is not going to assure success. I am pleased that someone else, namely Secretary Cheney is considering a scenario that has Mr. Gorbachev suddenly out of power. We ought to consider that. We ought to be prepared. He is

mortal. Things happen. Also he has a very difficult, tough political caucus to keep happy. Ask Nikita Khrushchev's people about that.

Mr. Speaker, we all remember what the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] said about caucuses, and I think privately Mr. Gorbachev might agree with that assessment.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE OIL SPILL RESOURCE RESTORATION ACT

(Mr. SMITH of Vermont asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Oil Spill Resource Restoration Act, which will create a new way of assigning liability for catastrophes such as the one in the Prince William Sound in Alaska from the *Exxon Valdez*.

The bill has two parts. First, it will shift the financial burden of cleanup from the backs of the American taxpayers to the rightful place, to the profits and the wallets of Exxon's shareholders. The business deduction about which Exxon has boasted will be immediately disallowed.

Second, it will add a new level of liability to the current statute. Not only will the company be liable for its cleanup and also for restoring any economic deprivation to business men or women in the area affected, but also now we will change the way we measure liability to measure environmental damage so that a natural resources trustee commission will be set up following a spill of this magnitude. Its job through the courts will be to tell Exxon what needs to be replaced, and the U.S. court for Alaska will then force them to follow through.

The cost of the damage to the natural resources of Prince William Sound will be recovered not based on how much the animals are worth dead, but instead it will be based on exactly how much it will cost to replace or restore it all, alive and well.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILL ON TRANSVERSE MYELITIS

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation which is based on equity. Our American veterans have sacrificed an enormous amount to defend the freedom and liberties which we hold so dear. We make an implied promise to each and every one of these veterans that we will not forget them in their hour of need.

Many American veterans suffer from an illness known as transverse myelitis upon their departure from the armed

services. Transverse myelitis is a clinical syndrome in which there is evidence of complete or partial loss of neurological functions, generally resulting from inflammation of the spinal cord. Under the present system, however, symptoms of this serious neurological disorder must appear within 1 year of the veteran's departure from the service in order for them to receive disability benefits.

Conversely, the presumptive period for multiple sclerosis is 7 years from the veteran's separation from the service. Transverse myelitis has been linked to multiple sclerosis and there is no need for this double standard when dealing with these two ailments. It is patently unjust and we owe our veterans more than this.

My legislation would treat transverse myelitis in the same manner as multiple sclerosis. Veterans who acquire transverse myelitis within 7 years of leaving the service would be eligible for disability benefits.

I would like to request that my colleagues in the House of Representatives cosponsor this legislation and assist me in securing its passage. We've made a promise to our veterans—now let us keep it.

□ 1300

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PICKETT). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

#### WALTER EDWARD GRADY UNITED STATES POST OFFICE

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 481) to designate the building located at 2566 Hylan Boulevard, Staten Island, NY, as the "Walter Edward Grady United States Post Office" as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 481

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the building located at 2566 Hylan, Boulevard, Staten Island, New York, known as the New Dorp Station, is designated as the "Walter Edward Grady United States Post Office Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to that building shall be deemed to be a reference to the Walter Edward Grady United States Post Office Building.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Mr. MOLINARI, is the sponsor of this bill. The post office involved is in his district. Based on the information he provided to the committee, the committee concluded it was altogether fitting and proper to name the building in question after Mr. Walter Edward Grady, who served for 27 years as a letter carrier in Staten Island, NY.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MOLINARI].

Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, since I have served in Congress, I have witnessed the naming of many buildings, highways, and other Federal facilities in honor of former Members of Congress and others generally referred to as "important" people. Their importance often times was measured by the titles they held and the length of time they served.

H.R. 481 will name a new postal building in my district for Walter Edward Grady, a common postal letter carrier. However, Walter Edward Grady was an extraordinary ordinary person. He worked at the same post office in New Dorp, Staten Island, for 27 years until his untimely death of cancer at the age of 51. For 25 of those 27 years, he delivered mail on the very same route. Throughout his long tenure of 27 years, he missed only 3 days of work until the terminal illness forced him to retire.

I've spoken with his fellow carriers, and they characterized Walter Grady as a lovable guy. In talking to the patrons that he served, it was obvious that he was not only loved but considered an important member of that community. He received various awards from his supervisors during his career. On seven different occasions, he received the Carrier of the Month Award, and four times he was named Safe Driver of the Month. He died shortly after his retirement and is survived by his wife, six children and many grandchildren.

Like other good citizens, he became involved in community efforts and participated on several occasions in the Muscular Dystrophy Telethon Drive.

It can be said, and perhaps should be said, that Walter Edward Grady was only one of many thousands of postal workers who often go unnoticed and do their job unflinchingly without a great deal of fanfare. So, as we take this step in naming a brand new shining post office in Staten Island after Walter Edward Grady, we also pay tribute to the many other postal workers who perform their jobs so well. I think that, from time to time, it is important for this body to pay tribute to an individual that some people may call an ordinary person. In truth, like so many of his fellow workers, Walter Edward Grady was an extraordinary ordinary person.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 481 will name a post office in Staten Island, NY, the "Walter Edward Grady United States Post Office Building." I support this bill as I feel it will honor not only Walter Edward Grady but all of America's, past and present, letter carriers. I commend my colleague from New York, Representative GUY MOLINARI, for introducing this bill.

Walter Grady was a letter carrier at the New Dorp Post Office in Staten Island for 27 years. He received numerous awards for outstanding service throughout his career. After an outstanding postal career Mr. Grady passed away in 1980.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation to honor an outstanding American, who spent his life serving his country.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 481, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to designate the building located at 2562 Hylan Boulevard, Staten Island, NY, as the 'Walter Edward Grady United States Post Office Building'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous material on H.R. 481, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

## ALLOWING MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO USE THE FRANKING PRIVILEGE TO DISTRIBUTE COPIES OF THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1149) to allow Members of Congress to use the franking privilege to disseminate copies of the Constitution of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1149

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

### SECTION 1. AUTHORITY TO USE THE FRANKING PRIVILEGE.

Notwithstanding section 3215 of title 39, United States Code, copies of any commemorative edition of the Constitution of the United States prepared under the auspices of the Commission on the Bicentennial of the United States Constitution may be mailed by Members of Congress as franked mail.

### SEC. 2. PROVISIONS RELATING TO USE OF AUTHORITY.

(a) ADVISORY OPINIONS; NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS.—Nothing in this Act shall be considered to exclude any matter mailed by a Member of Congress pursuant to this Act—

(1) from the provisions of subparagraph (A) or (B) (as applicable) of section 3210(d)(6) of title 39, United States Code; or

(2) from any numerical limitation under section 3210(d)(5) of title 39, United States Code.

(b) WAIVER.—In applying section 3210(f) of title 39, United States Code, the source of the funding for the preparation and printing of the matter made frankable by this Act shall not be taken into account for purposes of any mass mailing made pursuant to this Act.

### SEC. 3. REIMBURSEMENT FOR MAILINGS.

In computing the amount of any lump-sum appropriation pursuant to section 3216(a) of title 39, United States Code, an appropriate reduction shall be made to reflect the amount of any payment which the Commission on the Bicentennial of the United States Constitution may make to the United States Postal Service for the purpose of defraying postage costs and any other fees or charges associated with any mailings made pursuant to this Act.

### SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "franked mail" has the meaning given such term by section 3201(4) of title 39, United States Code;

(2) the term "Members of Congress" has the meaning given such terms by section 3201(5) of title 39, United States Code;



(3) the term "Member of the House of Representatives" means a Member of the House of Representatives, a Delegate to the House of Representatives, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico; and

(4) the term "mass mailing" has the meaning given such term by section 3210(a)(6)(E) of title 39, United States Code.

#### SEC. 5. TERMINATION.

The authority for a Member of Congress to send any matter as franked mail under this Act terminates at the end of calendar year 1989.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1149 was introduced by Mr. CRANE and is cosponsored by Mrs. BOGGS. Mrs. BOGGS and Mr. CRANE represent the House on the Commission on the Bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution.

This year marks the 200th anniversary of the convening of the first Congress under the Constitution. To commemorate this event, the Commission is proposing that a special commemorative pocket-size version of the Constitution honoring the bicentennial of the Congress be printed with contributions from the private sector.

The commemorative Constitution would then be given to Members of Congress for distribution as a postal patron mailing. Although no Member would be required to distribute the commemorative, under the bill the potential would exist to reach every household in the United States.

H.R. 1149 would permit these commemorative Constitutions to be mailed under the frank. To minimize costs, the bill provides that a postal patron mailing of the Constitution by a Member will count as one of the six such mailings allowed each Member each year under the law.

I urge your support for H.R. 1149.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1149, legislation introduced by Congressman PHIL CRANE of Illinois. I commend the gentleman from Illinois for his commitment and dedication to this effort. I also commend Congresswoman LINDY BOGGS and the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee Congressman BILL FORD for their contribution to this legislation.

In 1983, Congress established the Commission on the Bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution to promote and coordinate activities to commemorate the bicentennial of the Constitution. The Commission has proposed, as part

of its activities, to print a special commemorative pocket-sized version of the Constitution through contributions from the private sector.

This bill would authorize Members of Congress to disseminate these copies of their constituents as one of their six postal patron mailings authorized each year by the Franking Commission.

Under current law, the documents cannot be mailed under the congressional frank because the printing costs are being paid for by private donations. The frank can only be used to mail material prepared and printed at Government expense.

In celebration of the bicentennial of the Congress, Members of Congress should be given the opportunity to distribute the document that is the cornerstone of our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

□ 1310

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mrs. BOGGS].

Mrs. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1149, a bill to grant a very limited, one-time exception to the law governing the mailing of materials under the congressional frank. This legislation authorizes the use of the frank for mailing of copies of the U.S. Constitution—printed with private donations, not Government funds—as one of the six regular postal patron mailings permitted annually to each Member of the House.

The gentleman from Illinois and I have served as representatives of the House on the Commission on the Bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution since 1985. One of the Commission's major objectives as part of its effort to get the message of the Constitution across to the American people has been to make the Constitution itself more accessible to the average individual. Some people consider the Constitution to be some arcane legal document when, in fact, it is an accessible, easily understood work.

The Commission has prepared and printed several million copies of a pocket edition of the Constitution that have been circulated to schools, veterans' organizations, and fraternal groups. In addition, several major national corporations have printed and circulated, at their own expense, copies of pocket editions of the Constitution. All of these have been very well received by the target groups. However, they have reached only 32 percent of the U.S. population.

H.R. 1149 offers the opportunity to facilitate the distribution of copies of the Constitution into every household in the country. Families and individuals would then have the opportunity to have their own copies of the Constitution that they could read and discuss. In the process, they will develop a new appreciation of the strengths, the rights, and the responsibilities of the charter and the Government that has served this Republic so successfully for two centuries. With this added knowledge and understanding I feel confident that the future of the Republic will be secure for another century.

I urge approval of the motion.

This past weekend the gentleman from Illinois and I along with several other Members of the House in an official delegation were representing the House at the inaugural ceremonies of the 200th anniversary of the inauguration of George Washington in New York City. The patriotic fervor observed there and the great love and understanding of this country and its strengths and of the Government that was indeed instituted under the Constitution were just a joy for every American to behold. I hope that spirit will carry over on to this floor this day to know that every person, every household in the United States should have the privilege of owning and keeping a copy of the Constitution.

I think it would be a great service to all of the people of the United States if we were able to pass this bill, H.R. 1149.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], the ranking member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] and all the members of the committee and their staffs for the splendid work that they have done in this regard.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL].

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. Watch out America. Here comes another congressional boondoggle.

Cloaked in the guise of increasing the public's knowledge of the U.S. Constitution, H.R. 1149 is just another way for Members of Congress to put their names in their constituent's mail boxes. Unsatisfied by our 98 percent reelection rate, we are jumping at another chance to make ourselves look good at our constituents' expense.

The Congressional Budget Office has correctly estimated that the real costs to the taxpayers of this unwanted, unwarranted, and unnecessary mailing will be in about \$9 to \$10 million in fiscal year 1989 and fiscal year 1990. The mailing costs per copy would be 10.1 cents, for 90 to 100 million households.

The bill provides that this mailing would be counted as one of the six already permitted postal patron mailings annually. Members who now use 6 full mailings would not theoretically increase their mailing costs. However, since the average Member uses about half of the postal patron limit, for many or most, it will be an increase. For the rest, it will be a great improvement over the usual newsletter.

I do not object to making copies of the U.S. Constitution available to the general public. I just object to spraying copies all over the country, without anyone asking for them, just so Members of Congress can take credit for another free service. As far as I know, nobody has placed an order for a free copy of the Constitution, recently discussed as a family keepsake.

We can always send the Constitution to schools and libraries if we are really serious. But nobody would have a bit of interest in this mailing unless the Members of Congress' name was on it.

The public has become, with good reason, very unsympathetic toward Members who increase their allotments to reelect themselves at their constituents' expense. We have just recently rejected a measure to raise Members' own salaries. Then we increased our staff in both House and Senate. Then the Senate increased its mail privileges by a cost several times greater than the defeated pay raise. Here we go again—another \$10 million for congressional vanity and congressional reelection.

Many Members will justify their votes for this bill by citing the importance of the Constitution. Constituents, who have not asked for this \$10 million advertising from their Congressmen will be neither fooled nor amused. H.R. 1149 will ultimately be more albatross than advertisement. It should be defeated now.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have no further request for time.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, some 12 or 13 years ago when I arrived in Congress I remember going to one of those seminars that they have for Members of Congress in order to tell you how to make certain to be reelected after you got here.

They said there are three things that assured your reelection: First, you use the frank; second, you use the frank; third, if need be, you abuse the frank.

Well, if the CBO is right what we are about to do here is add about \$10 million worth of abuse because with this particular mailing it seems to me that we are going over and above where we have been on the frank before. Already the American public is

having problems with the amount of mail that flows out of Capitol Hill that is purely self-promotion in its origin.

It appears to me from what I can find out about this particular mailing that it is in fact something that can be used for self-promotion, that the Members' names will be included in some way with this mailing going out.

So therefore the Members will be in a position of being able to say to their constituents, "Look at this free service I am providing you, I am going to give you this keepsake of your heritage."

But what I cannot really understand is why this is necessary in the first place.

□ 1320

It is my understanding that we can already send copies of the Constitution to any person we want to. We have a House document around here that has the Constitution in it. That is perfectly frankable at the present time. Any person who writes your office right now and wants a copy of the Constitution, the Member can get a hold of the House document and send them a copy of the Constitution.

What we are doing in this case is we are coming up with a special print which will then be used to flood the country with mail out of the Member's office.

I am not so certain we are struggling to do the right thing for the taxpayers' money, that this is the way we ought to spend \$10 million, and so I would hope that my colleagues would vote no on this particular bill. It seems to me that it is something that we probably do not want to do, given the kind of fiscal restraints the country faces.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I take it that both of the previous speakers understand that the mailing of this pocket Constitution is within the control of each and every Member of the House. If they feel as strongly as they do about it being a vain and useless act, there is nothing in this legislation that requires them to do it, and I suspect that they will lead the charge to enlist as many Members as possible not to mail the Constitution.

I don't know whether that sells in their district, it will not sell in mine. I think my people will respond in a positive way because they would like to believe that their Congressman thinks they have the intelligence and the patriotism to both read and understand the Constitution and the patriotism to revere it.

I expect that if I choose to give up a newsletter in order to make this mailing, and that depends on the circumstances of what is happening around here from time to time, that I would expect the kind of people I represent

would put it in a place of honor right along with the family Bible. My people are good God-fearing patriotic Americans, and they think of the Constitution as I do, as a sacred document, and I think it will be handled that way. I cannot imagine, at least I have not met him or her in my district, any person who would denigrate the Constitution in any way.

Let me simply point out to the last gentleman who spoke, that he started out with his rationalization for being unstable and saying the basic thing wrong with it is Members can take something into people's homes with their name on it, then he proceeded to inform all of the people of the House of something I did not know before now, that there is available through the Document Room an unlimited supply of copies of the Constitution printed at Government expense, and that it is perfectly legal to make a mass mailing of those printed at Government expense, Constitutions with your frank on it.

Now, I don't know the gentleman's objections to making frankable a copy of the Constitution that is not printed at Government expense but will be printed with funds that will be raised by the Commission from private donors around the country. So if Members are looking at how to do this, the gentleman has given Members road maps of how to do it, and it will end up costing the taxpayers a lot more money than that.

What this legislation permits Members to do is to utilize in an effective way of distribution of the copies, the resources that private citizens of this country have made available to the Commission for the printing of this document. I think it is kind of an insult to suggest that they were self-serving or self-seeking in providing support for the Commission or that the former Chief Justice of the United States who chaired the Commission would make a request here if he thought it was just a throw-away piece of material that had as its principal value the name of whoever mailed it on the outside.

I think it is a reasonable piece of legislation, in my case, and I can speak only for myself, I use all six mass mailings of the year. To decide one of my mass mailings to distribute this Constitution is an important decision that I will have to make, so I cannot even make a commitment to my constituents as I stand here before all Members, that I am going to take advantage of the opportunity to do this. I suspect I will try to do it if it is at all possible, and I think that is the attitude that most Members of Congress will take when they approach that moment of decision.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call on the principal author of



this legislation, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE]. I know we all anxiously await his comments with regard to this very important piece of legislation. I would like to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], and the gentlewoman from Louisiana [Mrs. Boggs] for sponsoring this legislation. It is very important legislation, and I take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] for introducing this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE].

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from New York for yielding me this time.

I, too, want to salute the distinguished chairman and the minority chairman. I want to salute most especially, though, my esteemed colleague, the gentlewoman from Louisiana [Mrs. Boggs] with whom I had the privilege of serving on the Bicentennial Commission with, in honoring our Constitution.

That Commission was created by Congress, as an agency of the Congress of the United States to honor in 1987 the events that transpired in Philadelphia that we are addressing in today's conversation. That was the creation of our unique Constitution. In fact, the Chief Justice, Warren Burger, said:

The principal goal of the Bicentennial Commission is to stimulate an appreciation and understanding of our national heritage, a history and civic lesson for all of us. The lesson cannot be learned without first reading and grasping the meaning of this remarkable document, the first of its kind in all human history.

That is part of the Chief's statement in the pocket Constitution, the version that we are talking about. In line with the Chief Justice's concern about the dissemination of this precious document and trying to stimulate a greater interest and understanding of it in the classroom and in the home and amongst family members, many of whom have never even seen our Constitution, is an admirable objective.

What this legislation entertains is the possibility that at no expense to the taxpayer, and I want to repeat that, no expense to the taxpayer, the pocket Constitution can be made available if Members choose to avail themselves one of their frank mailings to either substitute this or incorporate it in a routine frank mailing. I know the CBO report suggests that this will cost \$9 to \$10 million, and then in their own report they say:

This estimate assumes that one copy of the U.S. Constitution will be mailed to each household and that such mailings would be in addition to and not a substitution for other mailings by Members of Congress.

Now, if you look at the legislation under section 2, it reads:

Nothing in this act shall be considered to exclude any matter mailed by a Member of Congress pursuant to the fact, from any numerical limitation under section 3210(d)(5), title 39, United States Code.

I think it is important for everyone to understand we are not talking an exclusion, we are not talking a special mailing. This is one of the normal mailings that Members are allowed to send out on an annual basis.

In addition to that, the cost of production, as the distinguished chairman of the committee pointed out in response to our colleagues from Pennsylvania, the cost of production of this document will be exclusively funded from the private sector, and if, in fact, there are Government documents, that comes at taxpayers' expense. The legislation was carefully tailored at the insistence of our distinguished chairman over here in such a way that there is no additional cost to the taxpayer in either the printing by the Commission on the Bicentennial, an agency of this body, and funding from private sector sources, and the incorporation in the numerical limitation with regard to the franking privilege.

I share some of the concerns of my colleague from Minnesota who spoke earlier about the self-serving nature of many of the newsletters that we are allowed to send out under the franking privilege, but an educational document so precious as our Constitution, guiding this body and all of our national government, is something that has educational value beyond comprehension.

□ 1330

In the absence of an understanding by the folks back home at the grassroots, we could engage in perversions that were never entertained by the Founding Fathers. This document hopefully is going to aid and abet a massive educational effort, and that was the whole reason the Commission on the Bicentennial was constituted.

This year, as our colleague, the gentlewoman from Louisiana [Mrs. Boggs], stated, we were up in New York City this past weekend, and they did the recreation of swearing-in of George Washington after they had produced a quorum in the first Congress of the United States which met 200 years ago last year. Next year we will celebrate the creation of the Judiciary and the Bill of Rights in 1991, and then the Commission will expire.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all the Members to please give very serious thought to participation in this worthy effort to get this precious document in every household in America.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise again in support of H.R. 1149.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] has given us a very clear and cogent explanation of this bill. I just checked and asked how much the Commission thinks it will spend to print these copies of the Constitution, and I am advised that it is \$10 million or more. I hope that people will bear in mind that that is \$10 million or more that is being put up by private citizens who think this is important enough that they should put their money up. I think with all the other problems we have around here, it need not be said that when private citizens indicate with their money that they think that is so important, we turn into the Grinch that stole Christmas at the last minute and say, "Well, it isn't something we printed, and so we are not going to mail it." That is how some people will interpret it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of this bill. I am surprised that it draws any resistance at all, and I trust that the Members will vote to pass the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PICKETT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1149.

The question was taken.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I object the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 174, nays 231, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 37]

YEAS—174

Ackerman	Conyers	Ford (TN)
Akaka	Coyne	Frost
Alexander	Crane	Garcia
Anderson	Crockett	Gaydos
Annunzio	Dannemeyer	Gejdenson
Anthony	Darden	Gibbons
Applegate	de la Garza	Gilman
Atkins	DeFazio	Gingrich
AuCoin	Dellums	Gonzalez
Baker	Dicks	Gray
Bilbray	Dingell	Green
Boggs	Dixon	Guarini
Bonior	Donnelly	Hall (TX)
Borski	Douglas	Hastert
Bosco	Downey	Hawkins
Boucher	Dreier	Hayes (IL)
Brooks	Durbin	Hayes (LA)
Brown (CA)	Dymally	Hertel
Bruce	Dyson	Hochbrueckner
Burton	Edwards (CA)	Horton
Campbell (CO)	Emerson	Houghton
Chandler	Evans	Hoyer
Chapman	Fazio	Huckaby
Clay	Flake	Hunter
Coelho	Foglietta	Hyde
Coleman (MO)	Foley	Jones (GA)
Collins	Ford (MI)	Jones (NC)

Kanjorski	Mollinari	Saiki	Smith (MS)	Stark	Walker
Kaptur	Moody	Sarpallus	Smith (NE)	Stearns	Walsh
Kennedy	Morrison (WA)	Savage	Smith (TX)	Stenholm	Watkins
Kildee	Murphy	Sawyer	Smith (VT)	Stump	Weber
Klaczka	Murtha	Scheuer	Smith, Denny	Sundquist	Weldon
Kolter	Neal (MA)	Schulze	(OR)	Synar	Wheat
Kostmayer	Neal (NC)	Schumer	Smith, Robert	Tanner	Whittaker
LaFalce	Nowak	Sikorski	(NH)	Thomas (CA)	Wilson
Lantos	Oakar	Smith (FL)	Smith, Robert	Thomas (GA)	Wise
Lehman (FL)	Oberstar	Smith (IA)	(OR)	Thomas (WY)	Wolf
Leland	Obey	Smith (NJ)	Snowe	Traxler	Wolpe
Lent	Owens (NY)	Solarz	Solomon	Upton	Wyden
Lewis (GA)	Owens (UT)	Stangeland	Spence	Valentine	Wyllie
Lipinski	Parris	Stokes	Sperr	Visclosky	Yates
Livingston	Pashayan	Studds	Staggers	Volkmer	Yatron
Long	Payne (NJ)	Swift	Stallings	Vucanovich	Young (FL)
Lowe (NY)	Pelosi	Tallon			
Madigan	Perkins	Tauke			
Manton	Pickett	Tauzin			
Marlenee	Pickle	Torres	Bateman	Florio	Pallone
Martinez	Porter	Torricelli	Bentley	Hatcher	Payne (VA)
Matsui	Quillen	Traficant	Brennan	Levine (CA)	Pepper
Mavroules	Rangel	Udall	Bustamante	Markey	Pursell
McCloskey	Richardson	Unsoeld	Courter	McCollum	Ravenel
McDermott	Ridge	Vander Jagt	Engel	McCreery	Roybal
McEwen	Ritter	Vento	Espy	Mfume	Schaefer
McGrath	Roe	Walgren	Fascell	Morella	Towns
McNulty	Rose	Waxman	Fawell	Morrison (CT)	Williams
Miller (WA)	Roth	Weiss	Feighan	Ortiz	
Mineta	Rowland (CT)	Whitten			
Moakley	Sabo	Young (AK)			

## NOT VOTING—29

Bateman	Florio	Pallone
Bentley	Hatcher	Payne (VA)
Brennan	Levine (CA)	Pepper
Bustamante	Markey	Pursell
Courter	McCollum	Ravenel
Engel	McCreery	Roybal
Espy	Mfume	Schaefer
Fascell	Morella	Towns
Fawell	Morrison (CT)	Williams
Feighan	Ortiz	

□ 1355

Messrs. WHEAT, RHODES, ASPIN, BERMAN, LEACH of Iowa, FLIPPO, SISISKY, and TRAXLER changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

#### AUTHORIZING 1989 SPECIAL OLYMPICS TORCH RELAY TO BE RUN THROUGH CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) authorizing the 1989 Special Olympics Torch Relay to be run through the Capitol Grounds, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I do not plan to object, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] for an explanation of his resolution.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and also thank him for his cooperation on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 71 authorizes the 1989 law enforcement torch run for the Special Olympics to be run through the Capitol Grounds, as part of the journey of the Special Olympics torch to the District of Columbia Special Olympics Spring Games at Gallaudet University in the District of Columbia, on or about May 19, 1989.

Mr. Speaker, currently there is a provision in the law prohibiting torches from being carried on the Capitol Grounds. The Congress did pass special legislation in 1984 so that the Olympic torch could be carried through the Capitol Grounds on its way to the Olympics in Los Angeles, and again, in 1986, 1987, and 1988 for the Special Olympics held at Gallaudet University.

The Internal Revenue Service, Criminal Investigation Division, is this year's host for the law enforcement run for D.C. Special Olympics.

Again this year, as in years past, a torch-lighting ceremony will begin the relay of law enforcement officers from the steps of the Capitol, through the District, concluding at Gallaudet University. The goal is to show law enforcement's support for Special Olympics and raise money for the Special Olympics organization through the 1989 law enforcement torch run for Special Olympics.

Mr. Speaker, founded in 1968 by Eunice Kennedy Shriver, the Special Olympics Program offers year round training and competition in 14 official sports to any individual with mental retardation, age 8 or more, including aquatics, track and field, gymnastics, volleyball, and softball.

Mr. Speaker, enactment of this legislation is a very positive step toward promoting interest in the Special Olympics and I urge passage of House Concurrent Resolution 71.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I rise in support of this resolution which would authorize the 1989 law enforcement torch run for Special Olympics to be run on Capitol Grounds.

The torch relay has become the traditional opening of the D.C. Special Olympics, with various local police organizations leading the torch from the Capitol to Gallaudet University—site of the D.C. Special Olympics Spring Games.

I commend Congressman NORM LENT for introducing the resolution this year, and the Criminal Investigation Division of the IRS for serving as the host of this year's relay.

The House has passed similar resolutions for the past several years, and I urge passage of House Concurrent Resolution 71 by the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LENT], the author of the resolution.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very worthwhile program. It is to raise funds for physically challenged individuals. It is a resolution which deserves our support.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in supporting House Con-

## NAYS—231

Andrews	Gallo	McCurdy
Archer	Gekas	McDade
Armey	Gephardt	McHugh
Aspin	Gillmor	McMillan (NC)
Balenger	Glickman	McMillen (MD)
Barnard	Goodling	Meyers
Bartlett	Gordon	Michel
Barton	Goss	Miller (CA)
Bates	Gradison	Miller (OH)
Beilenson	Grandy	Mollohan
Bennett	Grant	Montgomery
Bereuter	Gunderson	Moorhead
Berman	Hall (OH)	Mrazek
Bevill	Hamilton	Myers
Billirakis	Hammerschmidt	Nagle
Bliley	Hancock	Natcher
Boehlert	Hansen	Nelson
Boxer	Harris	Nielson
Broomfield	Hefley	Olin
Browder	Hefner	Oxley
Brown (CO)	Henry	Packard
Bryant	Herger	Panetta
Buechner	Hill	Parker
Bunning	Hoagland	Patterson
Byron	Holloway	Paxon
Callahan	Hopkins	Pease
Campbell (CA)	Hubbard	Penny
Cardin	Hughes	Petri
Carper	Hutto	Poshard
Carr	Inhofe	Price
Clarke	Ireland	Rahall
Clement	Jacobs	Ray
Clinger	James	Regula
Coble	Jenkins	Rhodes
Coleman (TX)	Johnson (CT)	Rinaldo
Combest	Johnson (SD)	Roberts
Conte	Johnston	Robinson
Cooper	Jontz	Rogers
Costello	Kasich	Rohrabacher
Coughlin	Kastenmeier	Rostenkowski
Cox	Kennelly	Roukema
Craig	Kolbe	Rowland (GA)
Davis	Kyl	Russo
DeLay	Lagomarsino	Sangmeister
Derrick	Lancaster	Saxton
DeWine	Laughlin	Schiff
Dickinson	Leach (IA)	Schneider
Dorgan (ND)	Leath (TX)	Schroeder
Dornan (CA)	Lehman (CA)	Schuetter
Duncan	Levin (MI)	Sensenbrenner
Dwyer	Lewis (CA)	Sharp
Early	Lewis (FL)	Shaw
Eckart	Lightfoot	Shays
Edwards (OK)	Lloyd	Shumway
English	Lowery (CA)	Shuster
Erdreich	Lukens, Thomas	Sisisky
Fields	Lukens, Donald	Skaggs
Fish	Machtley	Skeen
Flippo	Martin (IL)	Skelton
Frank	Martin (NY)	Slaterry
Frenzel	Mazzoli	Slaughter (NY)
Galgely	McCandless	Slaughter (VA)



current Resolution 71, which authorizes the annual law enforcement run marking the start of the U.S. Special Olympics on May 19. I'd like to thank my distinguished colleagues, Mr. ANDERSON, chairman of the Public Works and Transportation Committee, and Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, the committee's ranking Republican, for their help in bringing the legislation to the House floor in such a timely fashion.

The event begins with a torch-lighting ceremony that will be held on the steps of the U.S. Capitol. From there, a relay of law enforcement officers will run from the Capitol, continue on a designated route through the District of Columbia, and finish at Gallaudet University where the Special Olympics will be held.

The goal of the relay is to show law enforcement's support for the Special Olympics games and to help raise financial assistance to continue this worthwhile program for physically challenged individuals. The Internal Revenue Service, Criminal Investigation Division, is this year's host for the torch run, and the folks there have done a fantastic job organizing this exciting event.

However, before any of this can happen, Congress must give its approval for use of the U.S. Capitol steps as the site of the torch-lighting ceremony that kicks off the festivities. The U.S. Special Olympics offers the challenge and thrill of competition to some very special people. I hope my colleagues will show their dedicated support for this worthwhile cause by voting for passage of House Concurrent Resolution 71.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, this resolution, which authorizes the 1989 law enforcement torch run for Special Olympics to be run through the Capitol Grounds on May 19, 1989, will serve to promote the spring games of the D.C. Special Olympics.

The Special Olympics torch-lighting ceremony and relay run by various local law enforcement agencies have become the symbolic start of the annual D.C. spring games.

By adopting similar resolutions in the past, Congress has recognized the accomplishments of the fine athletes who participate in the Special Olympics games. I would urge that we continue that support by passing House Concurrent Resolution 71 today.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

#### H. CON. RES. 71

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),*

#### SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF RUNNING OF SPECIAL OLYMPICS TORCH RELAY THROUGH CAPITOL GROUNDS.

On May 19, 1989, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate may designate jointly, the 1989 Special Olympics Torch Relay may be run through the Capitol Grounds, as part of the journey of the Special Olympics torch to the District of Columbia Special Olympics

spring games at Gallaudet University in the District of Columbia.

#### SEC. 2. RESPONSIBILITY OF CAPITOL POLICE BOARD.

The Capitol Police Board shall take such action as may be necessary to carry out section 1.

#### SEC. 3. CONDITIONS RELATING TO PHYSICAL PREPARATIONS.

The Architect of the Capitol may prescribe conditions for physical preparations for the event authorized by section 1.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ANDERSON

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON: On the first page, lines 3 and 4, strike "SPECIAL OLYMPICS TORCH RELAY" and insert in lieu thereof "1989 LAW ENFORCEMENT TORCH RUN FOR SPECIAL OLYMPICS".

On the first page, lines 8 and 9, strike "Special Olympics Torch Relay" and insert in lieu thereof "Law Enforcement Torch Run for Special Olympics".

□ 1400

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the amendment simply clarifies the official name of this event as the 1989 Law Enforcement Torch Run for Special Olympics.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the amendment and on the concurrent resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PICKETT). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

#### TITLE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ANDERSON

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON: Amend the title so as to read: "Concurrent resolution authorizing the 1989 Law Enforcement Torch Run for Special Olympics to be run through the Capitol Grounds."

The title amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7, APPLIED TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1989

Mr. DERRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 101-43) on the resolution (H. Res. 143) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) to amend the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act to extend the authorities contained in such act through the fiscal year 1995, which was referred to

the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1486, MARITIME ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL YEAR 1990

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 138 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 138

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1486) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1990 for the Maritime Administration, and for other purposes, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2(1)(6) of rule XI are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and which shall not exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule and each section shall be considered as having been read. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PICKETT). The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLLEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 138 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 1486, a bill authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 1990 for the Maritime Administration and for other purposes. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be divided equally and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The rule waives all points of order against the bill for failure to comply with clause 2("1")6 of rule XI, the 3-day layover rule for committee reports. At the time that the Rules Committee considered the rule for H.R. 1486, it was expected that the bill would be considered at the end of last week, necessitating this waiver. As the bill will be considered after the 3-day layover period, this waiver is no longer necessary.

The rule further makes in order an amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries now printed in the bill as an original bill for purposes of amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1486 responds to requirements of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. It is intended to provide the Maritime Administration with the means to carry out its responsibility for programs to promote a strong U.S. Merchant Marine for the waterborne carriage of U.S. foreign and domestic commerce and for national defense purposes.

The bill authorizes an estimated \$535.8 million for the Maritime Administration for fiscal year 1990. This amount is approximately the amount recommended by the administration. It includes a total of \$310 million for programs of the Maritime Administration and approximately \$225 million for the Maritime Administration's Operating Differential Subsidy Program. This program helps U.S.-flagged vessels to compete internationally with foreign ships.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated earlier, House Resolution 138 is an open rule making the bill under consideration open to any germane amendment. This resolution has been endorsed by both the minority and majority members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. It will facilitate the consideration of a bill that is needed to promote our Nation's shipping capabilities and I urge its speedy adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, here it is 1989 and the maritime authorization bill is on the floor of the House again.

Mr. Speaker, for the 27 years I have been here, we have been hammering away at the merchant marine issue, and the committee has done a beautiful job under the constraints, but the merchant marine of this Nation is going down the drain unless we get a handle on it, unless we can build it up so that it can be a part of our defense posture. We need to do that right away. Do not wait until the situation

is absolutely desperate. We must not be dependent on foreign bottoms and foreign crews, because in the event of a national emergency, we will be without a viable merchant marine.

Mr. Speaker, I remember during World War II when the merchant marine fleet and the crews aided greatly in our victory, and we must always remember that. Here we are again not beefing up our merchant marine as much as we should. It is time that we took a look and did something more about it.

We spend billions and billions and billions for our national defense, and yet we let the merchant marine slip through our fingers. I think it is a shame and a disgrace that we would go to foreign bottoms, foreign crews, and let the American merchant marine sailors go without work. It is time that we did something about it.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule under the reservation that we in future years do something more about it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the ranking member of the Committee on Rules for bringing this rule before us. Also, I want to commend the chairman of the full Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, as well as the ranking member and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LENT].

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] is absolutely right. What has happened to our merchant marine fleet in this country is only rivaled in disgrace by the fact that our railroad industry is now the worst of any industrialized nation in this world. It is time this Congress and this administration did something about it.

There is no way that American shipbuilding industries today can compete with all of the subsidizations coming from the foreign governments for all of the shipbuilding industry overseas. It is about time that the U.S. Government started to get in the business of buying their own ships and leasing them out to the private sector. That way we could have American-built bottoms. We could build up merchant marine fleet, and we would be protected in case of emergency should we ever have to go to war again.

Mr. Speaker, I do commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and also the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DAVIS] for all of their support in bringing this bill together. We should support it unanimously here today.

□ 1410

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 4 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to start out by commending the chairman of the overall committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LENT] for a good bill. I support the rule and will support the bill.

In my three terms I have not found any Member that been more instructive or given more advice or taken more time with young Members than the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] and I want to say that I appreciate it and many young Members appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today with my standard Buy America amendment that Members are now familiar with which offers a weighted advantage to American firms. I will offer it to this bill. It gives a 6-percent weighted advantage to American firms competing against a foreign firm for a contract or a bid under this particular Act.

There are two provisos. One is that the item has to be made in America with at least 50 percent domestic content and be made by American hands. There is a proviso that if it is not made in America, naturally it does not apply.

One particular thing I would like to respond to today is that there is a reporting requirement that the Secretary of Transportation will have to give a report at the end of each year as to how the GATT agreements interact and interrupt this type of legislation. Hopefully Congress will come to see that more of our tax dollars should be going to American companies.

One point I would like to make is several years ago we found on the floor that a law was passed in Japan creating \$60 billion for public works projects over 10 years. The small print in the law said only Japanese companies could bid on the work. When the U.S. Trade Representatives heard that he said "My God, I can't believe it." When the Pentagon heard about it they said "This is crazy. I can't believe they would do something like that."

When we pushed the Japanese to explain their position, they said yes, it is true. They decided to keep the jobs and money in Japan. When pushed further, they said that is our job here in Japan. Maybe you people in Congress should be taking care of America.

Let me remind Members that 2 years ago the Pentagon, our Army, bought 5,000 Toyotas from Japan. They purchased a \$60 million computer from



Japan. Japanese companies 2 years ago got almost \$3 billion worth of public works projects in America, but their bill said only Japanese companies can apply.

I am getting some talk about protectionism. This is not protectionism. This gives a weighted advantage to American firms, and it offsets the taxpayers' costs for unemployment compensation, food stamps, welfare.

I say let us keep people working with dignity rather than putting them on the dependency rolls with welfare. That is what the amendment will do.

At the time it is offered I am sure the chairman will have some questions and I will be glad to answer those questions. I will be offering my Buy American amendment, and I hope it will be received favorably by the House.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). On June 15, 1988, and again on July 6, 1988, the Chair made an announcement which cautioned all Members to refrain from references in debate to the official conduct of other Members where the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct had not filed a report on the conduct of that Member where that Member's conduct was not the subject of a question of the privilege of the House then pending before the House, and similarly not to refer to the motivations of Members who may have filed complaints before that committee.

This standard was relied upon by the Chair on March 22, 1989. The Chair reiterates this standard to indicate that 1 minute speeches and special order speeches which attempt to focus on conduct or motivations of Members are not in order under clause 1, rule XIV and under the precedents, because they inevitably engage in personalities in a manner contrary to the essential purpose of this legislative body.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Chair for the statement just made.

Mr. Speaker, there have been instances on the floor recently when Members have taken the well and openly discussed questions pending

before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

These instances, in my view, violate the Rules of the House, specifically rule 14.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we can spare the House of these incidents. They make matters worse, not better. They may vent some of the frustrations and anxieties felt by Members on both sides, but that alone is no justification.

The rules which govern this House are rules which require reasoned judgment, not emotional outbursts.

The needs of the institution must transcend the needs of the individual Member in situations like this, whether it be Members who are accused, or Members who set themselves up as defenders of the accused.

The rules of the House and the precedents we have in place must be adhered to and respected. The Nation is watching how we proceed through this thicket of ethical behavior and judgments. The people are waiting to see how we perform and they will pass ultimate judgment on what we do, what we say, and what we decide.

Let's attempt over the next weeks and months to live up to the very high standards set for us by those who wrote the rules and established the precedents by the people we serve and by the media who scrutinize us so closely.

In short, Mr. Speaker, let's behave like gentlemen and ladies of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the distinguished Republican leader for his statement.

#### MARITIME ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL YEAR 1990

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 138 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1486.

□ 1417

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1486) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1990 for the Maritime Administration, and for other purposes, with Mr. DERRICK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LENT] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the bill, H.R. 1486, which authorizes fiscal year 1990 appropriations for the Maritime Administration. The Maritime Administration is responsible for developing and maintaining a strong U.S. merchant marine capable of meeting our country's vital interests in commercial trade and national defense. Unfortunately, our national policies have not adequately directed our resources to provide for either a strong U.S. merchant marine or a healthy American shipbuilding base.

Our national security requirements will be in serious jeopardy if the U.S.-flag fleet and our American shipyards continue to decline. More than 95 percent of the cargo and petroleum products needed to support our military forces overseas must be carried by strategic sealift. During peacetime, U.S.-flag ships carry 10 million tons of dry cargo and almost 14 million long tons of petroleum each year to support the Military Sealift Command's cargo needs. With the number of U.S.-flag oceangoing ships down to an all-time low of 424 ships, we are facing a serious erosion of our sealift capabilities.

Our commercial trade interests are an essential part of our Nation's economic development, and support for the merchant marine and maritime industry is needed to protect this vital basic industry.

H.R. 1486 is intended to provide the Maritime Administration with the means to allocate the admittedly limited funds for maritime programs of the Department of Transportation. The bill authorizes an appropriation of \$309,830,000 for nonsubsidy programs administered by the Maritime Administration and authorizes such sums as may be required to liquidate 1990 operating differential subsidy [ODS] contract obligations.

ODS is a program to assist U.S.-flag ships to operate competitively in the U.S. foreign trade. The Administration estimates that the actual outlays for ODS contract obligations in 1990 would be approximately \$226 million.

H.R. 1486 includes \$3,750,000 for research and development and reallocates funds which the Administration had included in operations and training for this purpose. Federal outlays are not increased by the redistribution of funds, but the emphasis on research and development indicates a congressional intent to support R&D programs to improve the efficiency and competitiveness of our fleet and shipyards.

H.R. 1486 authorizes the same amount of funds for the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy and the State maritime academies as was requested by the administration. With regard to the State academies, the bill specifically authorizes that the funds be used for assistance to the schools and their current fleet of five vessels. This is in contrast to the administration's plan to reduce the schools' training vessels to three ships in 1990 and two ships in 1991.

Three other sections in H.R. 1486 address the State maritime academies:

Section 2 amends the student incentive payment program by requiring a student who accepts Federal aid to commit to the Naval Reserve after the first year of school.

Section 3 requires the Secretary of Transportation, within 1 year, to submit a study to Congress to determine how current training school vessels and other available vessels may be used for onboard ship training.

Section 4 increases the Federal share of direct payments to the regional academy, without increasing Federal outlays.

H.R. 1486 also authorizes \$246,909,000 for the National Defense Reserve Fleet, including the Ready Reserve Force. Previously, most funding for this program was in the Navy. This amount is consistent with the administration's request, and reflects the downturn in available commercial, militarily useful vessels—and the need to fill the void with vessels in the RRF capable of being placed in service on 5 to 20 days' notice.

Section 5 further clarifies the relationship between the Maritime Administration and the Department of the Navy regarding the Ready Reserve Force. It sets out the terms under which the Navy can activate and use the vessels in the RRF. Contracting-out of maintenance work on the NDRF is also limited.

Section 6 reauthorizes the Secretary of Transportation to provide war risk insurance until 1995.

And, finally, section 7 of the bill authorizes the Secretary of Transportation to designate National Maritime Enhancement Institutes.

H.R. 1486 is a fair representation of how we believe the Maritime Administration should spend the limited funding available for these vital programs essential to the national security and commercial trade needs of our country. I urge your support for this important legislation.

□ 1420

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure for me to join our distinguished committee chairman, the Honorable WALTER B.

JONES, and rise in support of H.R. 1486, the authorization bill for the Maritime Administration [MarAd], and to commend him for his leadership in bringing this measure to the floor of this House.

H.R. 1486 is the annual authorization for the programs of MarAd within the Department of Transportation. MarAd is the primary agency of Government that provides support and promotional assistance to the American merchant marine.

This legislation is very similar to the President's budget request for the line items that need to be authorized. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee made some adjustments in the way that the funding will be identified and allocated, but the overall dollar total is very close to the administration's request. The total outlay under H.R. 1486 would be around \$535,830,000. The administration request is for \$533,450,000. The difference is \$2,380,000.

We did make one change in this bill, compared to previous authorization bills. We have not put a dollar figure in this legislation for the operating-differential subsidy [ODS] program. Instead, we provided such funds as might be necessary to the agency in order for them to meet any contractual obligations under existing ODS contracts. The administration budget projects this amount to be around \$226 million for fiscal year 1990. Our committee does not have information indicating that the figure would be any higher than that—but the language of this bill would allow the agency to pay additional funds to vessel operators should they elect to expand the use of their existing ODS contracts.

The other significant provision of this bill is a requirement that MarAd produce a study in 1 year on methods of providing at-sea training to student cadets. The administration has proposed a two-ship sharing program amongst the five coastal maritime academies. The superintendents of the schools believe that a more appropriate method would be to employ five ships that are currently in the Government's Ready Reserve Force. Our committee felt that the agency should review all possible methods of at-sea training before selecting any one particular method. Consequently, in this bill we require the study and do not permit the agency to change the existing training program that has a school ship at each coastal academy until the study is completed.

H.R. 1486 also contains a section that clarifies the roles that MarAd and the Navy play with regard to the operation and management of the National Defense Reserve Fleet [NDRF]—including the Ready Reserve Force. The administration requested this provision. The bill also in-

cludes another provision in this same section that would limit MarAd's ability to contract out the maintenance of the NDRF.

Another provision of the bill would refine the program that enables MarAd to give student incentive payments [SIP's] to student cadets at the six State maritime academies. The agency would prefer to eliminate the SIP program altogether but our committee believes it just needs some adjustments—but should not be terminated.

The final section in H.R. 1486 would give the agency the authority to select National Maritime Enhancement Institutes. These institutes would be nonprofit institutions of higher learning and would have a special expertise that would enable them to assist the Government in developing both short and long-term solutions to domestic maritime problems. No special funding is contained in this bill and research grants to an institute could only be made from funds specifically appropriated by Congress for that purpose.

Mr. Chairman, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has crafted a good piece of legislation that is well within budgetary constraints. It also provides the type of oversight and guidance that I believe is appropriate for Congress to do.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1486.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PICKETT].

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1486, the Maritime Administration authorization bill for fiscal year 1990. This important legislation deserves the support of the House.

Just last month, Mr. Chairman, the Maritime Administration released statistics on the status of the privately owned, deep-draft fleet of the U.S. merchant marine, and the news was most depressing. As of September 1, 1988, there were only 427 oceangoing ships and 83 Great Lakes vessels, a decrease over the past year alone of 42 vessels.

Even more alarming, as 1988 ended, MarAd reported that not a single new commercial vessel was under construction in any shipyard in the United States. This situation has existed since November 9, 1987, when the last commercial vessel under construction in a U.S. yard was delivered to its owner.

Much needs to be done to ensure that our maritime industry will be capable of supporting the economic needs and the national defense requirements of the United States. The funds authorized in H.R. 1486 for the maritime industries are fully justified,



and that justification particularly applies to the research and development section, which authorizes \$3.75 million for R&D activities of the Maritime Administration.

As explained in the committee report, "the research and development function is necessary to develop concepts, methods, systems, and equipment that will improve productivity and operating efficiency in the U.S. shipbuilding and ship operating industries." These R&D programs "are aimed at the development of information and technology that will result in lower shipbuilding costs, operating costs, and Government subsidies for both ship construction and operation." Two million two hundred and fifty thousand dollars is specifically authorized for vessel design and shipyard studies.

It is essential that funds be authorized and appropriated for this critical function if the United States is to keep pace with other countries in the area of ship technology. The \$2,250,000 contained in this bill is the first step in getting MarAd back into the business of research and development. The administration did not request R&D funding for fiscal year 1990.

If a U.S. shipbuilding industry is to exist and thrive, research must be conducted on shipyard productivity improvements, on advanced ship designs, and on identifying an international market for high technology commercial ships. Other countries have been spending millions on research and development while MarAd has been dismantling its R&D activities. Today, there is essentially no money being invested by MarAd to promote shipyard productivity or to pursue ship research and design. The MarAd Office of Technology Assessment was formed in 1987, after the Offices of Advanced Ship Development, Advanced Ship Operations, and Maritime Technology were closed. The current functions of the Office of Technology Assessment heavily emphasize ship operations and cargo handling—but not ship construction.

While we are doing essentially nothing in this area, other nations are investing heavily in high technology ship designs and advanced production processes. Although it is difficult to quantify the extent of foreign investment in this area, we do know that Japan, for example, is investing heavily in ship research and development. The Japanese Ship Research Institute—an arm of the Japanese Ministry of Transport—spent \$24.4 million in fiscal year 1987 and \$21.9 million in fiscal year 1988 alone. R&D in Japan prior to 1974 emphasized building bigger and faster ships. After 1974, the emphasis was placed on lowering production and operating costs. Then in 1986, the Government's focus turned toward high value-added ships.

Longer-term research is currently being conducted on ship applications of superconducting machinery.

The United States once led the world in ship technology breakthroughs. We still maintain that position in the production of sophisticated state-of-the-art naval combatants and nuclear submarines. We can once again lead the world in commercial ship technology. But, this cannot be accomplished without a long-term commitment to research and development or without a cooperative government/industry effort to that goal. This commitment is long overdue.

I encourage my colleagues to support this bill which is a beginning aimed at restoring America's competitiveness in commercial shipbuilding.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1486, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Maritime Administration for fiscal year 1990, is not controversial. Although the administration has opposed certain provisions, I am confident with the floor amendment which will be offered today, we will have overcome a significant point of contention with respect to the Ready Reserve Fleet.

H.R. 1486, as introduced, contained a provision to increase direct payments to the Great Lakes Regional Academy. No additional budget authority was sought for this change nor is one required. Our review indicates that sufficient funds are available in Marad's operating budget for the maritime academies to implement this regulatory change. The Great Lakes Academy is the only regional academy in the country. The Federal dollars are matched by State dollars and this added funding will give the Great Lakes Academy an incentive to appeal to Great Lakes States other than Michigan for funding. This is going to be a boost for the regional academy, projecting a need to increase their enrollments over the next few years because the Great Lakes shipping industry is back on the rise.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, shipboard training of academy cadets has been a difficult issue for the administration and this committee and one which has yet to be resolved.

Unfortunately, I am not convinced that the schools are getting a fair hearing on this issue and, for that reason, I must support the amendment made by my colleague, Mr. STUDDS, at the full committee markup and included in the present text of H.R. 1486. I do so not to encourage delay but to assure that the necessary review and hearing does, in fact, take place.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1486, the maritime authorization bill.

This legislation reflects the continued commitment of our committee to the maintenance of a strong merchant marine and to a well-equipped and maintained National Defense Reserve Fleet.

In addition, the bill requires a comprehensive study by Marad of ship training opportunities at the State and Federal maritime academies.

In conducting this study, we expect Marad to consider seriously a proposal by the presidents of the State academies to use vessels

soon to be acquired for the Ready Reserve for academy training.

As Members may know, there are plans to expand the Ready Reserve Force from its current level of 91 vessels to as many as 120 by 1992. Under the academy presidents plan, three of the newly acquired vessels would be asked to play a dual role as academy training ships and as troop transport ships in the Ready Reserve. This would eliminate the need to acquire new training vessels to replace those now in service at our maritime academies in Maine, Texas, and California.

In recent years, some in the executive branch have argued that we should simply retire the training ships in these States and ask the five State academies to share the two that are left. The proposal of the academy presidents would allow each academy to have its own training vessel at a cost to the Federal Government that it is little more than what we will be paying to maintain the same vessels in the Ready Reserve.

H.R. 1486 does not require Marad to accept the academy presidents' plan. It does require them to study it; and to maintain the current fleet of five training vessels until that study is complete.

In closing, I want to congratulate the chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES]; and the ranking minority member on the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York, [Mr. LENT], for their leadership on this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BRENNAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1486, the fiscal year 1990 Maritime Administration Authorization Act. At a time when our Nation's merchant marine fleet is declining, this legislation is important to help curb that trend.

As a member of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I have had an opportunity to review testimony and reports on the status of the maritime industry—and the outlook is bleak. In fact, last week while appearing before the House Armed Services Committee, Secretary of Defense Cheney and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Admiral Crowe claimed that the state of our merchant marine fleet was dismal. We are also facing a deteriorating shipbuilding/ship repair industrial base. It is important for our Nation to address these important issues and this legislation makes a valid attempt.

An important provision of the legislation is authorizing funding for the Maritime Administration's Operating Differential Subsidy [ODS] Program. This program helps U.S.-flag vessels engaged in U.S. international commerce to compete against usually subsidized foreign ships by offsetting some of the high operational costs for the U.S. vessels. The Bush administration has raised objections to this provision of the legislation. However, I believe the industry needs this modest assistance to combat the increasingly subsidized foreign competition.

The need for a viable merchant marine fleet to provide necessary sealift is universally accepted. To maintain our current fleet and reverse the declining trend, we need a greater emphasis placed on ODS funding. While the outbreak of hostilities abroad remains unlikely, I remain troubled by the threat posed by our

sea-borne transportation being captured by foreign flagged vessels. Their reliability is questionable and hampers our ability to have confidence in an important transportation system.

Another important provision of this legislation relates to continued funding for the State maritime academies. The \$8.7 million provided for these institutions reflects the continuing commitment of this Congress to the vital role they offer the Nation in training future maritime officers. I am also pleased with the prohibition on the ship sharing plan called for by the Bush administration. This proposal could seriously affect the training ability of these institutions to provide the quality education they are known to offer. The language in this bill requires a full and complete study of the benefits of any ship sharing proposal be presented to Congress. This study will enable us to accurately judge the ship sharing concept before moving to hastily adopt the proposal. Our maritime academies continue to graduate top-quality young men and women who serve ably in our maritime industries. We must not hamper this vital training by restricting needed funding.

I urge my colleagues to express our strong commitment to a viable maritime industry by joining me in support of H.R. 1486.

□ 1430

Mr. LENT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and each section is considered as having been read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

#### H.R. 1486

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. In fiscal year 1990, the following amounts are authorized to be appropriated for the Maritime Administration—

(1) any amounts necessary to liquidate obligations under operating-differential subsidy contracts for the fiscal year 1990 portion of the total of current contract authority;

(2) \$3,750,000 for research and development activities, to remain available until expended, including—

(A) \$2,250,000 for vessel design and shipyard studies; and

(B) \$1,500,000 for other research.

(3) \$33,205,000 for expenses related to manpower, education, and training, including—

(A) \$23,157,000 for maritime training at the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, New York;

(B) \$8,670,000 for assistance to the State maritime academies and the current fleet of five training ships; and

(C) \$1,378,000 for manpower and additional training;

(4) \$25,966,000 for operating programs, including—

(A) \$17,853,000 for general administration;

(B) \$957,000 for development of water transportation systems; and

(C) \$7,156,000 for use of water transportation systems; and

(5) \$246,909,000 for expenses related to national security support capabilities, including—

(A) \$245,608,000 for the National Defense Reserve Fleet, including—

(i) \$86,865,000 for fleet additions, replacements, acquisitions, and upgrading of vessels for the Ready Reserve Force;

(ii) \$118,615,000 for maintenance and operations programs in support of the Ready Reserve Force; and

(iii) \$4,000,000 for Ready Reserve Force facilities;

(iv) \$29,550,000 for Ready Reserve Force vessel conversions; and

(v) \$6,578,000 for other programs in the National Defense Reserve Fleet; and

(B) \$1,301,000 for emergency planning operations.

Sec. 2. (a) Section 1304(g) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1295c(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking "and" the second place it appears;

(2) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraph (C) and substituting the following:

"(C) paid by the Secretary for the first complete or partial academic year of attendance to the individual in a lump sum of \$1,200 or on a prorated basis based on actual attendance, and at a time during the second academic year when the individual enters into an agreement accepting midshipman and enlisted reserve status as required under paragraph (2); and

"(D) paid by the Secretary for the academic years after those years specified in subparagraph (C) as the Secretary shall prescribe while the individual is attending the academy."

(3) in paragraph (2), by striking "apply for midshipman" and substituting "accept midshipman and enlisted reserve";

(4) in paragraph (3)(D), by striking "to apply for an appointment as," and

(5) in paragraph (4), by striking "has attended a State maritime academy for not less than two years" and insert "has accepted the payment described in paragraph (1)(C) of this subsection".

(b) The amendments made by this section apply to individuals who commence attendance after December 31, 1989, at a State maritime academy in accordance with section 1304 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1295c).

Sec. 3. With the funds authorized under this Act, the Secretary of Transportation, after consultation with other agencies in the executive branch and the State, regional, and Federal maritime academies, shall submit to Congress a study within one year to determine how currently employed training vessels, United States-flag commercial vessels, vessels in the Ready Reserve Force, and other vessels under the control of the

United States Government may be used to provide training opportunities for State, regional, and Federal maritime academy students that will produce licensed graduate officers. This study shall include data on the cost effectiveness to the United States Government; cost impacts on the affected State governments; safety of any vessels involved; safety of the students; operational and scheduling impacts upon the several entities; liability exposure, and the impact on national security sealift. No changes in current shipboard training programs at the State maritime academies are authorized until completion of this study and review by the Congress.

Sec. 4. Section 1304(d)(1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1295c(d)(1)) is amended—

(1) after "(d)(1)" by inserting "(A)"; and

(2) striking the second sentence and substituting:

"(B) Subject to clause (C) of this paragraph, the annual payment to the academy under this subsection shall be at least equal to the amount given to the academy for its maintenance and support by the State in which it is located, or, for a regional maritime academy, by all States cooperating to sponsor the academy.

"(C) The amount under clause (B) of this paragraph may not be more than \$25,000, or—

"(i) \$100,000 if the academy satisfies subsection (f)(2) of this section; or

"(ii) \$200,000 if the regional maritime academy satisfies subsection (f)(2) of this section."

Sec. 5. Section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 App. U.S.C. 1744) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 11. (a) The Secretary of Transportation shall maintain a National Defense Reserve Fleet, including any vessel assigned by the Secretary to the Ready Reserve Force component of the fleet, consisting of those vessels owned or acquired by the United States Government that the Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of the Navy, determines are of value for national defense purposes and that the Secretary of Transportation decides to place and maintain in the fleet.

"(b) Except as otherwise provided by law, a vessel in the fleet may be used only—

"(1) for an account of an agency of the United States Government during a period during which vessels may be requisitioned under section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1242); or

"(2) under a charter, contract, or other agreement arranged by the Secretary of Transportation.

"(c) The Secretary of Transportation may enter into a contract for the maintenance of the fleet, including the force, only for—

"(1) the repair, activation, operation, berthing, towing, or lay-up of a vessel;

"(2) a vessel used by a State maritime academy; and

"(3) obtaining maintenance technical services when—

"(A) the technical expertise required for that service is beyond the capabilities of the fleet staff or when the fleet has insufficient personnel resources to adequately maintain the fleet; and

"(B) the contract does not result in reducing employment at the fleet site."

Sec. 6. Section 1214 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1294) is amended by striking "1990." and substituting "1995."



**NATIONAL MARITIME ENHANCEMENT INSTITUTE**  
**SEC. 7. (a) ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary of Transportation may designate National Maritime Enhancement Institutes.

**(b) SCOPE.**—Activities undertaken by the Institute include—

(1) conducting research concerning methods for improving maritime industries' performance;

(2) enhancing the competitiveness of domestic maritime industries in international trade;

(3) forecasting trends in maritime trade;

(4) assessing technological advancements;

(5) developing management initiatives and training;

(6) analyzing economic and operational impacts of regulatory policies and international negotiations or agreements pending before the international bodies;

(7) assessing the compatibility of domestic maritime infrastructure systems with overseas transport systems;

(8) fostering innovations in maritime transportation pricing; and

(9) improving maritime economics and finance.

**(c) APPLICATION.**—An institution seeking designation as a National Maritime Enhancement Institute shall submit an application under regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

**(d) SELECTION CRITERIA.**—The Secretary shall select a designee under this Act on the basis of the following criteria:

(1) the demonstrated research and extension resources available to the designee for carrying out this subsection;

(2) the capability of the designee to provide leadership in making national and regional contributions to the solution of both long-range and immediate problems of the domestic maritime industry;

(3) an established program encompassing research and training directed to enhancing maritime industries;

(4) a demonstrated ability to assemble and evaluate pertinent information from national and international sources and to disseminate results of maritime industry research and educational programs through a continuing education program; and

(5) the designee be a nonprofit institution of higher learning.

**(e) ELIGIBILITY FOR GRANTS.**—The Secretary may make research grants to an Institute from amounts appropriated for that purpose.

**AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONES OF NORTH CAROLINA**

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

Section 5 of the bill is amended by striking "(2) under a charter, contract, or other agreement arranged by the Secretary of Transportation," and substituting:

"(2) on the request of the Secretary of the Navy, and in accordance with memoranda of agreement between the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Defense, for—

"(A) testing for readiness and suitability for mission performance;

"(B) defense sealift functions for which other sealift assets are not reasonably available; and

"(C) support of the deployment of the United States armed forces in a military contingency, for military contingency operations, or for civil contingency operations

upon orders from the National Command Authority; or

"(3) for otherwise lawfully permitted storage or transportation of non-defense related cargo as directed by the Secretary of Transportation with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense."

Mr. JONES of North Carolina (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer contains clarifying language only, and does not change the import of the bill as reported in any way.

The provision in the legislation the amendment modifies sets out the relationship between the Navy and the Maritime Administration in the way in which the Ready Reserve Force is managed, and the permissible uses to which ready Reserve Force vessels may be put. In setting out the cooperative arrangement, reference, in the bill as reported, was made to agreements arranged by the Secretary of Transportation. This reference applied to a memorandum of agreement by the Secretary of Transportation with the Secretary of Defense.

At the request of both Departments, I am offering this amendment that merely states in precise language those items in the memoranda of agreement that describe the permissible activity for vessels activated by the Navy from the Ready Reserve Force.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We have had an opportunity to go over this amendment. We understand that it was prepared jointly by MarAd and the U.S. Navy to incorporate the understanding they have with respect to this issue, and the minority has no objection. We are prepared to accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was agreed to.

**AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT**

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT: Add at the end of the bill the following new section:

**SEC. 8. BUY-AMERICAN REQUIREMENT.**

(a) DETERMINATION BY SECRETARY OF STATE.—If the Secretary of State, with the concurrence of the United States Trade Representative and the Secretary of Commerce, determines that the public interest so requires, the Secretary of Transportation

is authorized to award to a domestic firm a contract that, under the use of competitive procedures, would be awarded to a foreign firm, if—

(1) the final product of the domestic firm will be completely assembled in the United States;

(2) when completely assembled, not less than 50 percent of the final product of the domestic firm will be domestically produced; and

(3) the difference between the bids submitted by the foreign and domestic firms is not more than 6 percent.

In determining under this subsection whether the public interest so requires, the Secretary of State shall take into account United States international obligations and trade relations.

**(b) LIMITED APPLICATION.**—This section shall not apply to the extent to which—

(1) such applicability would not be in the public interest;

(2) compelling national security considerations require otherwise; or

(3) the United States Trade Representative determines that such an award would be in violation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade or an international agreement to which the United States is a party.

**(c) LIMITATION.**—This section shall apply only to contracts for which—

(1) amounts are authorized by this Act to be made available; and

(2) solicitations for bids are issued after the date of the enactment of this Act.

**(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—The Secretary of Transportation shall report to the Congress on contracts covered under this section and entered into with foreign entities in fiscal year 1990 and 1991 and shall report to the Congress on the number of contracts that meet the requirements of subsection (a) but which are determined by the United States Trade Representative to be in violation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade or an international agreement to which the United States is a party. The Secretary of Transportation shall also report to the Congress on the number of contracts covered under this Act and awarded based upon the parameters of this section.

**(e) DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section—

(1) the term "domestic firm" means a business entity that is incorporated in the United States and that conducts business operations in the United States; and

(2) the term "foreign firm" means a business entity not described in paragraph (1).

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say many people ask why I have taken the time to offer these amendments, and probably more than anything else, they require a report to tell Members just how screwed up our procurement policy is.

Just real briefly, my district was once, Youngstown-Warren, OH, area in northeast Ohio, the third largest industrial producing region of the world,

and in the last 15 years we lost 55,000 jobs that averaged \$12 to \$14 per hour, and replaced them with jobs that pay \$3.35 to \$5.59 and no benefits, and it seems that nobody is listening yet.

Yet when I look around and I look back at the days when I was a youngster, I can remember over the holidays family members talking about the Japanese coming in and the NATO countries coming in and taking pictures and photographs of our factories, our managers giving them the blueprints of the factories, and they went back to Japan with the photos and built the factories, and now they have the factories and we have the photographs.

Now try to get some of our industry into some of those foreign countries. They say any attempt made in this direction is protectionism. I would like to know who is more protectionist than Japan, and they enjoy a \$70 billion trade surplus with this country.

Now this meager amendment would only be relating to any funds authorized under this act. It would give a 6-percent weight advantage to an American firm competing against a foreign firm for one of those bids, and the guys that provide literally made-and-assembled-in-America with 50 percent of their parts and contents domestically produced and gives a little bit of a shot.

It does provide and has limitations, that where this particular amendment runs into and collides with our General Agreement on Tariffs and Trades it is thus weighed, but then the Secretary of Transportation would have to give Members a detailed report how many times that occurred. So that hopefully someday Congress can come back and start compiling information, looking where the American taxpayer dollar is going and making sure it is trying to go to American companies.

So instead of food stamps and welfare, people might have a job, and that our country and our standard of living, we will not have to apologize for, and we do not have to accept the standard of living of that of Korea, for example, to compete. So that is the amendment in a nutshell. It is sort of common language to a degree, and I will answer any questions that any Member may have on the amendment.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. After hearing this great explanation, this side has no objection to the amendment at this time.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Chairman, we have had an opportunity to go over the gentleman's amendment, and we have no objection to it.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate the fine work Members have offered to me and the help of your staff, as well. I do not think there

are two better friends of the merchant marine industry in this country than our distinguished chairman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LENT]. I thank you very much and I hope that we keep it in conference and get those reports back so we can finally document where our taxpayer dollars are going for procurement purposes.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, as the vice chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee which provides funds for the Maritime Administration [MarAd], I wish to share my views on one particularly important issue raised in this reauthorization for MarAd.

MarAd nears completion of an implementation plan for the sharing of training vessels between the five State maritime academies. Performance of this plan is pursuant to a directive within MarAd's fiscal year 1988 Appropriations Act. The act required a study of ship-sharing, and prohibited further purchase or construction of training vessels until a plan for sharing between the State academies had been approved by MarAd.

The concept of ship-sharing is not new. In fact, a report of the House Merchant Marine Committee produced in the late 1970's anticipated the future sharing of training vessels. MarAd, itself, has conducted three studies of at-sea training alternatives, in addition to the current implementation plan.

Each of MarAd's studies demonstrated, as does the current detailed plan, that the five State academies could very well schedule on-board training time in a manner that permits the sharing of two ships, despite the State academies' claims to the contrary. Furthermore, ship-sharing would enhance the safety of cadets, provide adequate preliminary indoctrination, provide the required sea-time training, and result in more efficient use of the training ships.

Ship-sharing also avoids an excessive and impossible cost—that of replacing the individual ships assigned to each of the five State academies. This year, in testimony before the Subcommittee on the Departments of Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies, MarAd stated that three ships would likely require replacement within 10 years or less, absent ship-sharing. The total replacement costs would range between \$60 million and \$90 million, and those estimates envision using existing ships.

In effect, a detailed plan to maintain or improve the current training scheme, and save upward of \$100 million, is ready to go. Yet this bill would block its implementation in fiscal year 1990, requiring a fourth study to examine more training alternatives.

As a matter of pride, the States' desire to each have a ship is understandable. But as a matter of fiscal reality, ship-sharing is an inevitable option. It accords the highest attention to the training requirements of the schools and the safety of the cadets and crews, it employs the ships more efficiently, and it saves many millions in costs over the coming years.

MarAd has taken a demonstrably solid concept and gone to enormous lengths to implement it responsibly, including consultation with the academies. Recognizing the good inten-

tions behind the bill's provisions, I am very disappointed at the prospect of delaying a perfectly good solution from coming about next year. I would hope nothing in this bill is considered prejudicial with respect to MarAd's implementation plan, and I would reiterate this Members' insistence that any future funds for training ship replacement occur only after implementation of a two-ship sharing plan.

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1440

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendment to the bill? If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. FLIPPO] having assumed the chair, Mr. DERRICK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1486) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1990 for the Maritime Administration, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 138, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1486, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following com-



munication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC, May 1, 1989.

HON. JIM WRIGHT,  
The Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit one sealed envelope received from the White House at 2:30 p.m. on Monday, May 1, 1989 and said to contain the following message from the President whereby he transmits an agreement effected by exchange of notes February 17, 1989 and March 27, 1989, extending for the period of 2 years from July 1, 1989 until July 1, 1991, the Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea concerning Fisheries off the Coasts of the United States, constituting a governing international fishery agreement.

With great respect; I am,

Sincerely yours,

DONALD K. ANDERSON,  
Clerk, House of Representatives.

#### AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA CONCERNING FISHERIES OFF THE COASTS OF THE UNITED STATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 101-58)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and ordered to be printed:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of yesterday, Monday, May 1, 1989, at page S4540.)

#### ANNUAL REPORT FOR 1988 OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL ON THE AGING—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Tuesday, May 2, 1989.)

#### ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES FOR THE YEAR 1988—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United

States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Tuesday, May 2, 1989.)

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous material, on the subject of House Concurrent Resolution 71, which was agreed to earlier today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous material on the subject of H.R. 1149, which was rejected earlier today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

#### NATIONAL STROKE AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 62) designating May 1989 as "National Stroke Awareness Month," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, and I would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. GILMAN. I rise in strong support of Senate Joint Resolution 62, designating May 1989 as "National Stroke Awareness Month."

Stroke is the third leading cause of death in the United States. Approximately 500,000 Americans are affected by a stroke each year.

There are between 2 and 3 million Americans who survive strokes, which is the leading cause of adult disability. Stroke survivors require approximately \$13 billion annually in medical treatment, rehabilitation, and loss of potential economic output. One-third of those afflicted will die within 1 month. The effects of strokes exact a tremendous toll from the family caregivers, especially since presently there are no Federal programs which provide

any assistance for the long-term care services required by stroke victims.

Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 62 will bring national attention to this serious medical condition and help educate the American people in the symptoms, risk factors, and effects of strokes.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to be a sponsor of House Joint Resolution 68, which commemorates May 1989 as "National Stroke Awareness Month."

Many Members of the House of Representatives have expressed great interest and concern about this issue by cosponsoring House Joint Resolution 68.

The measure, which passed the House today, was approved by the other body on April 5.

Stroke is a distinct disease of the brain and nervous system which causes paralysis, language, perceptual, emotional, and cognitive impairments which afflicts about 600,000 Americans each year.

It is the third leading cause of death and leading cause of disability in the United States which costs nearly \$13 billion annually in medical treatment, rehabilitation, and lost potential economic output.

Approximately 3 million American stroke survivors have not fully regained their physical and mental abilities and remain significantly disabled.

This catastrophic disease devastates families and its long-lasting effects rob survivors and family caregivers of the most rewarding years of life.

An increase in the national awareness of stroke may stimulate greater interest, concern and participation of the American people and lead to increased research to reduce this devastating disease in this country.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

#### S.J. RES. 62

Whereas stroke is the third leading cause of death in the United States;

Whereas stroke is the leading cause of adult disability in the United States;

Whereas stroke is a distinct disease of the brain and nervous system, causing paralysis and speech, perceptual, emotional, and cognitive impairment;

Whereas there is insufficient public knowledge of stroke prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation;

Whereas between five hundred thousand and six hundred thousand Americans are affected by a stroke each year;

Whereas between two million and three million American stroke survivors have not fully regained their physical and mental abilities and remain significantly disabled;

Whereas stroke is a sudden catastrophe that devastates families and routinely robs survivors and family caregivers of the most rewarding years of their lives;

Whereas stroke costs the United States between \$12 and \$13 billion annually in medical treatment, rehabilitation, and lost potential economic output;

Whereas the National Stroke Associa-

tion's mission is to provide the means to reduce the incidence and effects of stroke through public and professional education, community service and research; and

Whereas increased national awareness of stroke may stimulate greater interest, concern, and participation by the American people and may lead to increased research and to reducing the overall impact of stroke in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That May 1989 is designated as "National Stroke Awareness Month" and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### NATIONAL CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS WEEK

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 135) to designate the week beginning May 7, 1989, as "National Correctional Officers Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, again reserving the right to object, I do not object, and I would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 135, a resolution to declare the week of May 7, 1989, as "National Correctional Officers Week."

As sponsor of this resolution I want to express my appreciation and that of our Nation's correctional officers to all of our colleagues who have added their names as cosponsors of this resolution which points to the vital importance of correctional officers.

We passed a similar resolution in 1984, 1985, and 1987, and it led to ceremonies throughout the country which honored correctional officers for their important work. There are nearly 300,000 correctional officers around the country who are responsible for maintaining order of the many who are confined as a result of criminal activity.

Correctional officers perform an essential task that few of us would be able to perform. Our criminal justice system operates under the premise that with proper guidance those who have been found guilty of criminal charges can be helped to return to a lawful way of life. This system breaks down without correctional officers, because if they are not there to shepherd this process who will be?

Last year, I was the sponsor of a bill which passed last year as part of the Omnibus Anti-

Drug Abuse Act of 1988, which increased the death benefits of public safety officers, including correctional officers, to \$100,000. That bill's passage showed that Congress was concerned about correctional officers. The passage of House Joint Resolution 135 will reaffirm our commitment to correctional officers and recognize that they are dedicated, hard-working professionals who have undertaken a task which is essential to an orderly society.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of our colleagues to support the passage of House Joint Resolution 135, a resolution declaring the week of May 7, 1989, as "National Correctional Officers Week."

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

#### H.J. RES. 135

Whereas American correctional officers who work in our jails and prisons are currently responsible for the containment and control of over six hundred thousand prisoners;

Whereas correctional officers must protect inmates from violence while encouraging them to develop skills and attitudes that can help them become productive members of society following their release;

Whereas the morale of correctional officers is affected by many factors, and the public perception of the role of correctional officers is more than often based upon dramatization rather than factual review;

Whereas good job performance requires correctional officers to absorb the adverse attitudes present in confinement while maintaining themselves as professionals in order to have their actions appreciated and accepted by the public at large;

Whereas correctional officers had been similarly honored by many States and localities;

Whereas correctional officers had been similarly honored by a joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled in 1984, 1985, and 1987; and

Whereas the attitude and morale of correctional officers is a matter worthy of serious congressional attention: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the period commencing May 7, 1989, hereby is designated "National Correctional Officers Week" and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to

revise and extend their remarks on Senate Joint Resolution 62 and House Joint Resolution 135, the joint resolutions just considered and passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

#### SOUTH PACIFIC POLICY

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matters.)

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, as you know, on his way to Australia last week, Vice President QUAYLE stopped in American Samoa for approximately 2 hours while his aircraft was being refueled.

I have previously expressed concern that while I was pleased the Vice President went to the South Pacific, he did not visit any of the Pacific Island countries along the way. I have since learned that the Vice President did request a meeting with the Prime Minister of Western Samoa and did discuss the possibility of a stop in Papua, New Guinea; however, because the Prime Minister's health, and because of the present political climate in Papua, New Guinea, these meetings were not possible. Nevertheless, I still expect more than words and incomplete efforts on the part of the Vice President. While I am pleased to see the Vice President has some understanding of the Pacific region, there are over 20 islands in the Pacific, and visits to these nations is one way to demonstrate our country's support of the Asia Pacific region, a region consisting of 64 million square miles, and over 17 times the size of the United States.

Because I am concerned with the administration's policy for the Asia region, I have included a provision in the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for fiscal year 1990 which, if enacted into law, will require the Secretary of State to analyze the Nation's policy for the region and report that policy to the Congress. I am grateful to Chairman DYMALLY of the House Subcommittee on International Operations, and to my distinguished colleague from Maine, Mrs. OLYMPIA SNOWE, for the support and assistance they provided with this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, while the Vice President was in American Samoa, the Governor and the people of American Samoa went to considerable effort to honor such a distinguished visitor, and paid great tribute to the Vice President in accordance with Samoan custom and tradition.

Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention, that while Vice President QUAYLE was in American Samoa last



week, he referred to the residents of Samoa as "happy campers," living in "Pogo Pogo." It was also reported that he said the residents of the territory should get more education.

While I do not believe these remarks were intended to ridicule the Samoan people, the question has arisen. Some of my fellow Samoans have asked about the meaning of the term "happy campers," and if the use of "Pogo Pogo" was an intentional reference to the cartoon strip "Pogo."

In an effort to clear the issue, I have written to the Vice President and asked him to explain his use of these terms. I believe his response should clarify any ambiguities in this regard.

#### QUAYLE IN PAGO PAGO, DECLARES A HOLIDAY— HAILS ISLANDERS AS "HAPPY CAMPERS"

PAGO PAGO, AMERICAN SAMOA.—Vice President Dan Quayle spent only two hours in this sun-drenched Pacific territory, but that was enough to convince him he liked it and the "happy campers" who live there.

"Maybe I'll just stay for a few days," Quayle told the islanders who honored him at a native ceremony and showered him with gifts. As he spoke, a Samoan beauty queen in a sarong dress shielded him from the hot sun with an umbrella.

"You all look like happy campers to me," said Quayle. "Happy campers you are, happy campers you have been and as far as I'm concerned, happy campers you will always be."

The vice president—on a refueling stop en route to Australia—proclaimed yesterday a public holiday for the roughly 38,000 people here. "I have the power to declare this a holiday . . . you can have the rest of the day off," Quayle told a cheering crowd of about 3,000 at Tafona International Airport.

The relaxation in Pago Pago was in sharp contrast with the grueling pace Quayle had kept for the previous 32 hours.

In that time, he delivered a speech in Chicago, met with former President Ronald Reagan in Los Angeles, attended a security briefing in Honolulu and played basketball at Hickam Air Force Base.

After visiting American Samoa, Quayle flew to Canberra, Australia, where Prime Minister Bob Hawke greeted the vice president and his wife, Marilyn, with an official 19-gun salute. The two were to have wide-ranging talks.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 29, 1989]

#### QUAYLE, ON TOP DOWN UNDER—FAILING TO LIVE UP TO HIS IMAGE, THE VEEP CHARMS AUSTRALIANS

(By Keith B. Richburg)

SYDNEY, April 29 (Saturday).—Australian journalists hosted Vice President Quayle for lunch at the National Press Club in Canberra the other day, and in keeping with their reputation for being aggressive, irreverent, even rude, one of the courses was quail eggs.

As he has done through much of his visit here, the vice president disarmed the Australians by asking whether they had already written their stories under the headline "Press Had Quayle for Lunch."

That headline never appeared, but this one did: "Dan Has 'em Eating Out of His Hand."

As he winds down a five-day visit here that was dominated by defense issues and trade disputes, Quayle seems to have reversed the largely negative reputation that preceded him.

Before the trip, said Mike Steketee, chief political reporter for the Sydney Morning Herald, Quayle was "considered a bit of an oaf."

But the vice president, a Republican from Indiana, deftly fended off such hostile questions as whether "Hoosier" stands for "who's your mother?" He charmed the press corps with self-deprecating one-liners and staged some well-coordinated made-for-TV appearances—including a cruise on the picturesque Sydney harbor and an unexpected stop for beers at a local pub. Now Quayle "comes across as a personable sort of fellow," Steketee said.

"There's been a very comprehensive, very concentrated and very smart public relations effort by the vice president's advisers," said Peter Robinson, editor of the Financial Review newspaper. "I think now most Australians are saying he's not a bad guy."

Australians seemed genuinely surprised, and angered, at the vigorous way in which Quayle, in press statements and in meetings with senior government officials, held his own in defending U.S. farm subsidies for exported goods—in a country sharply critical of American farm subsidies, which undercut Australian producers. In fact, some local political analysts said that by not budging from his tough line, Quayle may have inadvertently hurt the political standing of Prime Minister Bob Hawke, who made it a point to press the trade issue in private meetings with the vice president but came away publicly rebuffed.

Before the vice president began his visit Down Under—a largely ceremonial trip meant to mark Australian-American Friendship Week—Australians were expecting the Quayle they had been watching on television all week.

Television stations had been prepping their audiences for the trip by running film clips of some of the vice president's biggest gaffes of the 1988 presidential campaign. On the day he arrived, one newspaper ran a cartoon of Mickey Mouse admiring his new Dan Quayle wristwatch.

Quayle's brief stopover Wednesday at Pago Pago, American Samoa, did not disappoint observers here. He mispronounced the name of the island, calling it "Pogo Pogo," and went on to tell the inhabitants that "you all look like happy campers to me," and that they should get a higher education.

But once in Australia, it was "U.S. vice president turns on the charm" as one newspaper headline put it.

"Anyone who can laugh at himself can't be all bad," wrote the Daily Telegraph, a popular Sydney-based tabloid on Friday. "In fact, Mr. Quayle has acquitted himself extremely well . . . and belied the image of the buffoon unfairly foisted upon him."

"In a relatively short time [Quayle] has demonstrated there is more to him than the unseen and unheard candidate referred to as the Robert Redford look-alike in the run-up to the presidential elections," the Sydney Daily Mirror wrote. The newspaper said Quayle "demonstrated a sense of humor [and] an ability to field sensitive questions."

In his effort to reshape Australian public opinion, Quayle's most significant event was a nationally televised half-hour question-and-answer session at the National Press Club luncheon that featured the quail eggs and the question about Indiana's state nickname.

"I know that Australians enjoy seeing tall poppies cut down to size," Quayle told the reporters. "In that case, you must have been

pleased to see what happened to me during last fall's campaign."

He also noted that he was in Australia to commemorate the 1942 Battle of the Coral Sea, which marked the comeback of Allied naval forces in the Pacific. "Believe me," he quipped, "comebacks are a subject of great interest to me."

His only miscue came when he stumbled several times over the initials EEP, which stand for the Export Enhancement Program, which subsidized American farm produce for sale on world markets—the topic that caused the only major source of contention during Quayle's visit.

The vice president was adamant at his refusal to concede that the subsidies, aimed at the European Community, inadvertently may be undercutting Australia's farmers, who are dependent on exports.

In his meetings with Australian officials, and in answers to a barrage of press questions, Quayle insisted that any adverse effect on Australia was unintentional. Said an angry Hawke after meeting with Quayle, "If a bullet hits you in the head, it hurts as much if it was not aimed at you as if it was aimed."

Quayle's otherwise rave press reviews here likewise were overshadowed by his surprisingly tough stand on trade.

The Australian, a national newspaper, ran an editorial under the headline "Who Do You Think You're Kidding, Mr. Quayle?" The editorial said, "Read our lips, Mr. Quayle. Australians are not happy."

The vice president is scheduled to spend the weekend in the vacation city of Cairns on Australia's northeast coast, attending a barbecue and snorkeling at the site of the Great Barrier Reef, before flying off to Jakarta.

#### POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, May 3 will mark the 198th anniversary of a landmark event in the history of the Polish people.

On this date in 1791, Poland adopted its first democratic constitution, and to commemorate this important occasion, the Polish National Alliance will hold their 98th annual parade on Saturday, May 6, in Chicago. It will be my pleasure and honor to join with the many members and officers of the Polish National Alliance, other public officials, and civic and community leaders, who will be participating in this commemoration.

The parade will step off at 12 noon from Wacker Drive and Dearborn Street, and will consist of scores of floats, marching units, bands, and drums and bugle corps. The theme of this year's parade will also commemorate the 50th anniversary of the invasion of Poland. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Helen M. Szymanowicz, chairman of the May 3 observances and vice president of the Polish National Alliance for her outstanding efforts to again make this year's parade an overwhelming success; and I would like to extend my best wishes to Edward J. Moskal, recently elected president of the Polish National Alliance, for his continuing efforts on behalf of the Polish people, which

have enhanced the close ties between our country and the people of Poland.

The May 3 Polish Constitution, adopted only a few years after our own Constitution, has stood out as a monumental achievement in the history of Poland. The document serves as a symbol of progressive government under democratic principles, and still remains today as an inspiration to the millions of Poles who have struggled to remove the chains of tyranny of their Communist oppressor.

Today, more than ever before, the goal of reinstating their political, cultural, and religious freedom, seems to be within the grasp of the people of Poland. On April 5, the Polish Government and Solidarity wrote a new chapter in the history of Poland, by concluding their historic deliberations and signing agreements, ushering in a new era of social and political change. It certainly is a time of optimism and hope for the Polish people, since these agreements allowed Solidarity to formally register again as a trade union operating independently from the Polish Government and promised free elections, including opposition candidates.

I was glad to join with many of my colleagues in the House of Representatives in signing a letter of President Bush to express the interest of Congress in these talks, and to urge that the United States play an active and important role in promoting Polish reforms. A copy of that letter follows:

MARCH 30, 1989.

HON. GEORGE BUSH,  
President of the United States, The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing to express our interest in the Polish Roundtable negotiations and possible United States policy at the conclusion of the talks. Preliminarily, both the government and opposition negotiators have indicated the potential for significant social and political advances, most notably the creation of an upper chamber of Parliament to be chosen by free elections. If conclusions are reached at the Roundtable, targeted to end April 3rd, the United States will be in position to play a major role in promoting or restricting Polish reform. We recognize the complexities of Poland's problems, and that a responsible American policy will be contingent on the results of the Roundtable. However, we believed that failure to clearly define the U.S. policy toward Polish reforms will represent an opportunity lost for America to promote democracy within the Soviet Bloc.

We are confident you share our sentiment that the United States should do all it can to promote greater freedom, participation, and pluralism in Poland. Since World War II, the Polish people have led the most effective peaceful resistance against communist orthodoxy. As a result, Poland should maintain a primary position on America's foreign policy agenda. Now that Poland seems on the threshold of monumental reform, the struggle of the Polish people should not slip down on our list of priorities. America cannot afford to treat this great opportunity for democracy with indifference.

If the Polish Roundtable concludes successfully, Church Leaders and Solidarity's Lech Walesa will turn to the U.S. President and Congress for moral, economic, and political support. Thus far, the complexities of possible reform have favored calculated tentativeness rather than a defined U.S. reac-

tion. But come April 3rd, the United States must have an effective, responsive policy for positively influencing Polish reforms.

Foremost, Poland must address its severe economic problems. The Polish government must balance its foreign debt, and manage domestic supply and demand to control a 100% inflation rate. If the Poles immediately request debt relief measures to allow reform, what will be our response? Leaving economic policy solely to international organizations may prove unwise. By assuming an active and constructive approach to IMF, World Bank and Paris Club policy making, America can ensure that economic reforms are not separated from political considerations. Left to economists and bankers, radical price reforms may be instituted, without regard for the social and political upheaval that may follow.

After working with the IMF and the World Bank, the United States may consider bilateral programs aimed at promoting democracy and privatization. Some initiatives not requiring additional appropriations, such as granting GSP status, OPIC programs, further surplus agricultural offering to generate joint, OPID programs, further surplus agricultural offerings to generate joint commission funds, and cultural, educational and technological exchanges, might prove useful in increasing the quality of life during stressful economic reform. Overall, an American role in Poland's renewal, both bilaterally and within international organizations, will help guarantee the connection between economic reform and social-political reform.

By participating in the reform process, the United States can ensure that all foreign economic support is contingent on real progress toward freedom, pluralism, and power sharing by the Polish government. We must guarantee that the legislation of Solidarity, the proposed new chamber of Parliament, and free elections are irreversible steps toward democracy, not temporary concessions by the communist government. Conditioning effective economic reform on political and social improvements requires a carefully developed plan of monitoring the changes in Poland. Enough channels, primarily private Church and international groups, are already in place to establish effective oversight by the United States.

We the undersigned have assigned high priority to the ongoing negotiations in Poland and the opportunities the Roundtable may offer the Polish people. We realize that a successful American response to Polish reforms will require immediate cooperation between the Congress and the administration. We look forward to following your direction and working together for the interest of the long-struggling Polish people.

Mr. Speaker, we in Congress must continue to do everything that we can to promote and encourage the Polish Government to make good on its promises of reform, so that the people of Poland again one day may live in the ideals and principles embodied in their Constitution of 1791. I am glad to join with Polish-Americans in the 11th Congressional District of Illinois, which I am honored to represent, and Americans of Polish descent throughout the Nation, in expressing our unwavering support for the desire of the Polish people to pursue a course of justice, self-determination, and liberty, free from the tyranny of the Communists, in their own beloved homeland.

## FOREIGN LANGUAGE COMPETENCE FOR THE FUTURE ACT OF 1989

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill, the Foreign Language Competence Act for the Future Act of 1989, that is intended to bolster America's foreign language capabilities and build a solid basis for improved foreign language and international education for years to come. As you know, I have long been active in the effort to upgrade our foreign language capabilities, because I feel strongly that our future national security and economic prosperity depend increasingly on an ability to communicate in languages other than English, and understand cultures other than our own.

In the last Congress, I sponsored H.R. 1875, the International Education for a Competitive America Act, as part of this effort. A provision from this bill creating Presidential awards for foreign language teaching excellence and another, very similar to one from H.R. 1875, creating model elementary and secondary foreign language programs were both included in the School Improvement Act. Another provision from H.R. 1975 creating Centers for International Business Education was included in the Omnibus Trade Act. The Foreign Language Competence for the Future Act is intended to build on these and previous measures. I am pleased to be joined by Representatives MARTINEZ, COLEMAN, FUSTER, and UNSOLD of the Education and Labor Committee, as well as by Representatives CONTE, FAZIO, RANGEL, PORTER, and a total of 28 other cosponsors, in introducing this bill. In addition, I am pleased that Senator CHRIS DODD, with whom I have previously cooperated on several foreign language efforts, may soon introduce a similar bill in the Senate.

The National Governors' Association recently published a report, prepared by a task force headed by New Jersey Gov. Thomas H. Kean, on the state of international education in this country. The task force found that while there have been some recent improvements in this area, there still many disturbing indications. For example:

Only 17 percent of U.S. public elementary schools offer any form of language instruction, and only 3 percent of public and private elementary schools offer language programs enabling the learner to communicate;

Only 1 in 5 American high school graduates takes more than 2 years of a foreign language, while in Japan, 6 years are required for all students;

Twenty-six States report a shortage of foreign language teachers at the elementary or secondary level, and the shortage is getting worse, not better;

At the college level, 53 percent of students took no basic foreign language classes as undergraduates;

As for knowledge of geography, 1 in 7 adults could not locate the United States on a world map, and American youth knew less about geography than any age group in any country in a recent survey.



In response, the report calls for a national commitment to international education involving State agencies, all levels of education, and the private sector. Among its specific recommendations are that more students become skilled in foreign languages; that all college graduates know another language and also be familiar with the rest of the world; that teachers know more about international affairs; and that businesses have access to international education to improve their export position.

The legislation being introduced today is intended to help alleviate some of the serious deficiencies mentioned above, and addresses a number of the issues raised by the NGA report. The most important of these is training and retention of foreign language teachers at the elementary and secondary levels. In addition, the bill includes programs to develop foreign language curricula and materials for elementary and secondary schools, to bring foreign language instruction to remote and rural areas, and to enhance the access of businesses to language services and international information.

The severity of teacher shortages in foreign languages is graphically demonstrated by the measures some states are taking to fill the gaps. Fully 21 States now use alternate certification methods to find foreign language teachers, meaning that they develop different standards to find the teachers that they need. Obviously, this often results in persons teaching foreign languages who are not trained to do so, or even necessarily to teach. Eleven States provide fellowships and scholarships to persons studying and planning to teach foreign languages. Some even go abroad: Louisiana is recruiting for foreign language teachers in Belgium, France, Canada, and Mexico, while Georgia is recruiting in Germany.

This severe shortage is of course something that must be dealt with, but it is also partly the result of a very positive development: more and more States, recognizing the need for greater attention to foreign languages, are instituting foreign language requirements of some sort. This is already creating a greater demand for teachers, with 33 States already having some type of foreign language requirement in their schools, and the demand will grow tremendously as a number of new requirements take effect. Louisiana has already required for several years that students take a foreign language from grades 4 to 8. New York's Global Action Plan will require that, starting in 1990, high school students learn a foreign language and be able to develop a certain level of proficiency. North Carolina has determined that it will need up to 2,000 more foreign language teachers within a few years to implement that every student from kindergarten to 12th grade study a foreign language. A number of State university systems, including those of California, Indiana, and Minnesota have foreign language entrance or exit requirements, or both.

As I mentioned, all of these requirements, while probably having a very significant and positive long-term effect on Americans' knowledge of foreign languages, will greatly increase the demand for well-trained foreign language teachers. However, if we do not take action to meet that demand, there simply

may not be enough teachers to fill all of the requirements being mandated.

Therefore, the Foreign Language for the Future Act has as its largest component Summer Foreign Language Institutes, as well as a new foreign language loan program. The institutes are intended to allow current elementary and secondary foreign language teachers to become more proficient, as well as to allow teachers from other fields to retrain as foreign language teachers. It has been found that intensive training of the type that can be provided over a summer in a program specifically devoted to foreign languages can be very effective. This provision is similar to a summer language institutes provision, from a bill that I also authored, that was included as part of title VI in reauthorization of the Higher Education Act in 1986. However, the provision in the new measure concentrates exclusively on elementary and secondary teachers, including the provision for retraining, and allows for programs focusing on all languages. The title VI provision concentrates largely on foreign language students and on training in neglected languages, the traditional focus of title VI. I feel that the creation of this second Summer Language Institute Program, for teachers, is justified by the severe shortages discussed above.

The new Foreign Language Competence Loan Program, somewhat similar to the current Perkins Program, would establish a revolving loan fund to provide loans to students planning to major in elementary and secondary foreign language education. Loans of up to \$5,000 per year would be provided for majoring in commonly taught languages, and of up to \$7,500 for those that are less commonly taught. In addition, 1 year's loan would be forgiven for each 2 years as an elementary or secondary foreign language teacher. However, because of the especially severe shortages in many rural and inner-city areas, for those teaching in such districts, forgiveness would be provided on the basis of 1 year forgiven for 1 year taught. Because of the revolving nature of the fund, loan repayments in this program would be used to provide more loans. These two provisions would go far toward improving recruitment, training, and retention of qualified foreign language teachers.

As for the other education provisions, the program of demonstration grants for critical language and area studies is intended to encourage the development of curricula, educational material and equipment, and activities designed to improve and expand foreign language instruction at elementary and secondary schools. Just as there is a shortage of foreign language teachers, there is also a significant lack in many places of good teaching material and curricula. Demonstration grants for distance learning are intended to increase foreign language instruction in rural and remote areas. Sixteen States, including Nebraska, Oklahoma, California, and Alaska, have some type of distance learning, which uses modern technology to provide instruction in subjects which persons could not otherwise study in their schools or communities.

Finally, the bill would also make grants to States and metropolitan areas to establish Foreign Language Institutes, and foreign language components within existing bodies such

as world trade councils, to provide language training and other services for small- and medium-sized businesses. This would complement a provision creating centers of international business education which I already mentioned is now law.

The lack of foreign language and knowledge of other nations and cultures has been pointed to as a major handicap for businesses trying to enter export markets, and this is especially so for smaller businesses without access to many resources. As an example of how knowledge of other countries can help business here, Governor Baliles of Virginia, on a recent trip to Hong Kong, found out that chicken feet are a delicacy there. When he found out that they are also in short supply, he called poultry producers in Virginia and heard that chicken feet were routinely thrown away. In this way, a demand and supply were matched, and Virginia now supplies chicken feet to Hong Kong. There are numerous other instances such as this, and the creation of Foreign Language Institutes would provide the information to enable many companies, as well as entire cities and States, to expand their markets in ways that would not otherwise be possible.

Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Languages for the Future Act would not be costly, yet it would go far toward filling a crucial gap that still exists in this country's attention to foreign language and international education. I thank my colleagues for their past support of measure I have offered in this area, and urge them to once again work to bring the United States up to par with other countries in knowledge of other languages, lands, and cultures.

For the convenience of my colleagues, the bill's text follows:

#### H.R. 2188

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Foreign Language Competence for the Future Act of 1989".

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) the future economic welfare and national security of the United States will substantially depend upon our ability to educate our citizens to communicate in other languages;

(2) 26 States currently have severe foreign language teachers shortages and other predict severe shortages in the next decade;

(3) only 17 percent of United States public elementary schools offer any form of language instruction;

(4) instruction in major languages such as Russian, Japanese, Chinese, and Arabic are rarely offered at any educational level;

(5) many small- and medium-sized United States firms with export capacity and potential fail to take advantage of international markets because of lack of cross-cultural skills and expertise; and

(6) many small school districts in rural areas are unable to offer foreign languages except through technology for distance learning.

#### SEC. 3. SUMMER FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTITUTES.

(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary is authorized to provide grants to institutions of higher education or consortia of

such institutions for the establishment and operation of summer foreign language institutes for the professional development of the proficiency of elementary and secondary foreign language teachers.

(b) **PROGRAM PARTICIPATIONS.**—Programs operated with grants under this section shall—

(1) provide a preference for elementary teacher development and the retraining of secondary teachers for elementary schools; and

(2) allow teachers from other fields to retrain as foreign language teachers.

(c) **GRANT LIMITATIONS.**—Grants pursuant to this section shall—

(1) not exceed \$3,000 per teacher;

(2) not exceed 300 teachers per institute;

(3) not provide less than one institute in each State; and

(4) not exceed \$400,000 to any institution.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated \$50,000,000 to carry out this section for fiscal year 1990 and for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.

#### SEC. 4. FOREIGN LANGUAGE LOANS.

(a) **PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.**—The Secretary is authorized to allot funds appropriated under the authority of subsection (g) among State education agencies for the purpose of establishing revolving loan funds to encourage college students to major in elementary and secondary foreign language education.

(b) **LOAN LIMITS.**—Revolving loan funds that are established by a State education agency with funds provided under this Act shall be available to provide each student qualifying for assistance under this section who is majoring in a foreign language or foreign language education at an institution of higher education with education loans not to exceed—

(1) \$5,000 a year for those majoring in commonly taught languages; and

(2) \$7,500 a year for those majoring in less-commonly taught languages.

(c) **STUDENT REQUIREMENTS.**—A student is eligible to receive financial assistance pursuant to this section if the student—

(1) is enrolled as a full-time student in an institution of higher education;

(2) has not defaulted on any federally assisted student loan;

(3) enters into an agreement with the Secretary to pursue a teaching career in an elementary or secondary school after graduation; and

(4) agrees to annually provide, from a State education agency, verification of employment as an elementary or secondary foreign language teacher.

(d) **INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Each State education agency providing educational loans to students from a revolving loan fund established with funds provided under this Act shall—

(A) collect any loan or portion thereof in accordance with subsection (e), and

(B) certify annually to the Secretary that students receiving such loans are in compliance with the provisions of this Act.

(2) **REPAYMENTS.**—Each State education agency shall deposit all repayments of educational loans provided pursuant to this Act into the revolving loan fund of the State education agency established with funds provided pursuant to subsection (b).

(3) **ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.**—In any fiscal year each State education agency receiving assistance under this Act may retain an amount not to exceed 5 percent of the amount of funds allotted to the institution under subsection (a) for the costs of admin-

istering the revolving loan fund established under subsection (b).

(e) **LOAN TERMS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Each loan made to a student by a State education agency from a revolving loan fund established with funds provided under this Act—

(A) shall not accrue interest before the date that is 90 days after the day on which the student ceases to be enrolled at an institution of higher education;

(B) shall accrue interest at an annual rate of 5 percent after such date;

(C) shall be repaid over a period that does not exceed 10 years; and

(D)(i) shall provide for cancellation of one year's loan and interest for each two years of teaching foreign language in an elementary or secondary school; or

(ii) shall provide for cancellation of one year's loan and interest for each year of teaching foreign languages in an elementary or secondary school (I) serving a school attendance area that receives assistance under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, or (II) located in a rural area as defined by the Secretary by regulation.

(f) **LOAN FORGIVENESS.**—

(1) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—The Secretary annually shall reimburse State education agencies for the portion of the principal and interest of any loan that is canceled by reason of subsection (e).

(2) **DEPOSIT OF REIMBURSEMENTS.**—Each State education agency receiving payments pursuant to paragraph (1) shall deposit such payments into the revolving loan funds of the State education agency established with funds provided under this Act pursuant to subsection (d).

(g) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 1990 and for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.

#### SEC. 5. FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTITUTES.

(a) **PROGRAM AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary is authorized to make grants to States and major metropolitan areas on a matching basis to establish foreign language institutes, and for units within world trade councils, to provide language training, translation services, and information about other cultures and markets for small- and medium-sized businesses seeking to enter export markets.

(b) **GRANT LIMITS.**—No grant under this section shall exceed \$800,000 per State or city.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 1990 and for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.

#### SEC. 6. DEMONSTRATION GRANTS FOR DISTANCE LEARNING.

(a) **PROGRAM AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary is authorized to make demonstration grants to State education agencies, institutions of higher education, and nonprofit education and professional associations to provide technology for distance learning in cooperation with foreign language teachers and specialists to serve small and rural school districts, small colleges, community colleges, and adult business education classes through video tapes, cassettes, satellite linkages, cable programs, teleclasses, and computer-assisted instruction.

(b) **GRANT LIMITATION.**—No grants under this section shall exceed \$200,000 in any fiscal year.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1990 and for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.

#### SEC. 7. DEMONSTRATION GRANTS FOR CRITICAL LANGUAGE AND AREA STUDIES.

(a) **PROGRAM AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary is authorized to make demonstration grants to eligible consortia to operate critical languages and area studies programs, develop and acquire educational equipment and materials, and develop teacher training programs, texts, curriculum, and other activities designed to improve and expand the instruction of foreign languages at elementary and secondary schools across the Nation.

(b) **STUDY ABROAD REQUIRED.**—Each program receiving a grant under this section shall include a study abroad or cultural exchange program (or both).

(c) **GRANT LIMITATION.**—No grant under this section shall exceed \$2,000,000 to any consortium in any fiscal year.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1990 and for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.

#### SEC. 8. REGULATIONS.

The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this Act within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act. Such regulations shall establish procedures for the selection of grant and loan recipients, for the distribution of funds, and for the evaluation and review of the results of the programs authorized by this Act.

#### SEC. 9. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

(1) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Education;

(2) the term "institution of higher education" has the meaning provided by section 1201 of the Higher Education Act of 1965; and

(3) the term "State education agency" has the meaning provided by section 1201 of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

□ 1450

#### TRIBUTE TO COL. JAMES NICHOLAS ROWE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLIPPO). Under a previous order of the Hosue, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the privilege and the sad experience of attending a funeral of a friend of mine and a friend of the American people for that matter. He was a true hero. I do not know exactly how to describe what a hero is, but I think anyone who knows the facts and knows of the life of that great American would agree that he is indeed an American hero. I refer, of course, to the funeral that was held at Arlington Cemetery yesterday of Col. James Nick Rowe.

Mr. Speaker, Colonel Rowe was assassinated a few days ago in the Philippines by terrorists. He was over there in his role as colonel of the U.S. Army on special mission helping to



counter the terrorist activity of the guerrillas there that are trying to bring down the Aquino regime.

Now, how did I happen to wind up going to a funeral yesterday of a colonel that died in the Philippines? Well, I would like to take a few minutes here, Mr. Speaker, to tell my colleagues a little bit about this man, what an exceptional person he was and why I and the other Members of this House who would like to participate here would like to pay our respects to the memory of Col. Nick Rowe.

Mr. Speaker, in attendance yesterday of this somewhat obscure colonel, so far as the American people are concerned—in attendance at Arlington Cemetery was the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Chief of the Army, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Treasury, many general stars sprinkled throughout the audience and throughout the building there, and several Members of Congress; and what is it about this colonel and what has he done that would merit the attendance of such an august group attending his funeral? Mr. Speaker, that is what I want to talk to my colleagues about just a little bit today. In order to do that I have to go back several years.

On September 19, 1969, Mr. Speaker, I took the well of this House, standing as I am standing today, and for the first time I brought to the public attention from the Congress the plight of our prisoners of war being held in captivity in Vietnam. Until that day it had been the official position of the Department of Defense and the administration in power that it was the thing that we should not discuss, that we do not want to antagonize or alienate the Viet Cong or the North Vietnamese because they might make it tough on the prisoners they held.

Mr. Speaker, that was a fallacious and spurious opinion, but it was one that held sway in the administration at that time of President Johnson; Mr. McNamara, Secretary of Defense, and it was getting us nowhere, and I prevailed on the then Secretary of Defense, Mel Laird, to do away with that policy. It did not make sense. We knew that our young men were being imprisoned, captured, tortured, mistreated, maltreated, starved, brutalized, and it was time that the American people were told these facts and were awakened to it so that the world opinion could be brought to bear on the brutal, uncivilized treatment that our servicemen were enduring.

Mr. Speaker, I finally got the Department of Defense to reverse its former position, and they cooperated, and, as a result, we had the galleries here filled with families and loved ones of those who were being held in captivity, and Members came over to

the floor to participate. It was a great and glorious occasion. It was the first time there was a breakthrough, first time we had public discussion on the floor of treatment of prisoners of war.

I have here some of the pages from the special order. The chairman of the Armed Services Committee at that time spoke, and, if I might read a part of his statement again today, he says:

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Alabama for the effort that he has taken in this program to bring to bear on the bestiality of the savages of North Vietnam and what they are doing to human beings representing a civilization of kindness, of truth, of hospitality, and a generosity unknown and unparalleled in the history of the world.

Here is a nation, Mr. Speaker, which has not even practiced the simplest precepts of humanity to Americans in their own country. Prisoners of war—a constant parade of these men have come before our committee and borne mute testimony to the treatment that they have received at the hands of these savages. No names given—no report given—no nothing given of their conditions and their treatment, or anything—bringing heartaches, bringing tears—bringing troubles in the loneliness and the wantiness of their loved ones at home to see the last of their men who went off to war.

Mr. Speaker, it goes on for about half a page, and later following that Mr. McCormack, who was Speaker of the House, said, "Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?" I, of course, was very happy to yield to the Speaker of the House, and at that time Mr. McCormack said:

Mr. Speaker, I too join with the gentleman from Alabama and congratulate him for bringing this matter to the attention of the House of Representatives.

This is one of the great forums of the world of free people, where freedom, and freedom of expression exists.

The experiences of our prisoners of war are indeed intolerable. They violate not only international agreements but they violate the moral law and they violate the law of decency.

Not only are they treated under conditions that are inhuman but the failure in many cases to disclose the names of those who have been captured and whether or not they are living is an additional punishment for their loved ones in America.

And he went on for a few minutes there.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. McCormack was followed by the then minority leader of the House who later went on to become President of the United States, Gerald Ford. Mr. Ford spoke and said:

Mr. Speaker, I join with the Speaker and others who have spoken before and those who will be speaking subsequently to commend the gentleman from Alabama for taking the initiative, the leadership in obtaining this special order for this occasion today. Without his leadership I doubt we would have marked this occasion at this time. The attendance here today demonstrates—

And he was talking about the Chamber being filled.

demonstrates that this is a most deserving and worthwhile cause.

In this Chamber we can, as we have in the past, help to mold public opinion both at home and abroad. We must let the world at large know that the Communist leaders in North Vietnam are violating the Geneva Convention as to the treatment of American prisoners of war.

We all recognize that the leadership in North Vietnam is dominated by dedicated Communists.

And he goes on for about half a page talking about the violations of the Geneva accords, the treatment of prisoners and the inhumanity inflicted by man on man as to the treatment of our prisoners.

Following this I was contacted by a young fellow who wanted to come by and talk with me. He had heard of the special order. He was then a major, Maj. Nick Rowe. He came by and said that he had heard of this, and he wanted to tell me some of his experiences and thank me for what I am doing on behalf of the prisoners of war because he was the first American officer that had ever escaped from the Viet Cong.

Mr. Speaker, Col. James Nick Rowe was a prisoner of the Viet Cong for over 5 years. He was literally caged in a bamboo cage. He was starved, he was tortured, he was humiliated. He kept himself alive by eating slugs, snails, lizards, anything he could find to supplement his diet of rotten fish heads and rice served him once a day.

□ 1500

He was worked. This is in a very tropical, oppressively hot tropical jungle.

Twice he tried to escape unsuccessfully. He was caught. He was tortured, punished, locked up at night with a bar tied under his arms and to his legs, either tied or manacled. For over 5 years he endured this.

Finally he made another escape attempt. This time he was successful. He got back to the United States ultimately. He had to come by and tell me of some of the things that he and his fellow prisoners endured and some of the things that he had to say were just so incredible that it attacks one's beliefs, that a person could endure what he and others had endured and still live through it.

He had just recently been married. He was regaining his health.

As I said, at that time he was a major. We become friends and he went on to write a book about his experiences, which he wrote, called "Five Years to Freedom." Then for some inexplicable reason, the Army decided they did not want him to publish the book. He had a great deal of difficulty with the Army. He was still in uniform. He was still under Army control. They would not agree that he could

publish his book. I interceded on his behalf trying to get the Army to agree.

I do not remember exactly what happened then, but it is my recollection that in order to publish his book, he resigned from the Army, and he did publish his book and it was published and it is available today both in hard-back and paperback, called "Five Years to Freedom." I commend it to everyone's reading, "Five Years to Freedom."

Later he came back into the Army. The next I heard of Nick he was in Fort Bragg, SC, working with the special forces where he was using his knowledge and expertise in teaching soldiers of the special forces how to survive in combat and captivity under primitive conditions.

He went on to Panama on occasion with the special forces where we have a survival school in jungle warfare that we have been conducting for many, many years in Panama to teach general survival, where he met another friend of mine from Alabama, Morgan Smith, who was teaching survival warfare in jungles, working with the San Blas Indians of Panama and other Central American Indians there. They became fast friends.

Then the next I heard of Nick he was back with the special forces. If I am not mistaken, and this was kept hush-hush, he worked closely with our special forces that went into Desert I in the Iranian rescue attempt that failed.

He stayed in the Army. There are three things that he loved. He loved the Army. He loved his God, and he loved his country. He continued his service in the Army and was subsequently promoted.

As I said, when he was killed just last week in the Philippines, he was over there countering terrorist activity and trying to assist the United States in its endeavor to support the Aquino government to fight back the Communist insurgency forces of guerrillas that have been active there since the Aquino government has been in power.

He knew that he was on a hit list, but he and his wife and family, his second wife, would not be separated. They knew the hazards involved, but he elected to stay on.

He was assaulted by masked gunmen last week, finally losing his life in the service of his country.

As I have said so many times in speeches in my district and around the country, freedom is not free. It is one of the highest priced commodities that we have. In this case, once again someone has bought and paid for our freedom with his life, and I refer to Nick Rowe.

I was very gratified to see on the front page of today's paper, the Washington Times, a very large front page picture showing the funeral ceremony as he was on his way to his last inter-

ment. Nick was a legend in the Army. He was the stuff of which myths are made. Anyone who knew him could not help but be impressed by his sincerity, his love of country, and his love of God, which he told me and as he sets out in his book, is the thing that kept him going through those 5 years of torture, starvation, and maltreatment.

His friends and buddies from the Academy and those with whom he served in the infantry and the special forces, those who could come from all over the country to attend the funeral yesterday of this outstanding American who did so much for his country. Having endured so much at the hands of the Vietcong as a prisoner, he never lost his faith in his country. He lost faith in some of the people who served in this Congress. He was convinced that someone in this country blew his cover, so to speak, and ultimately divulged his real identity, because he has told his captors that he was an engineer. They found out, according to the book, from some elected official in the Congress who he really was and he knew he was marked for death and he had to make his last desperate attempt at escape, which he did successfully.

I think one of the most touching tributes that I have ever heard paid anyone was paid by a retired colonel as a eulogy yesterday at Arlington when he spoke from his heart because he had been a classmate of Nick. They had been roommates at the Infantry Basic Training School at Fort Benning. They had gone on to serve other tours together. Between choking up with the emotion and smiling with pride, he recounted many of the things that he and Nick had endured and the things that Nick had achieved.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert as part of my remarks the eulogy delivered yesterday at Arlington Cemetery by Nick's former roommate and classmate, Lt. Col. Bert Spivy, retired:

#### EULOGY FOR JAMES NICHOLAS ROWE

(Presented by Arlington National Cemetery, May 1, 1989, by a loving classmate and guy fortunate enough to have been called his and Susan's friend, Lt. Col. Bert Spivy, U.S. Army Special Forces, retired.)

Nick and Susan Rowe have been a perfect team, first as a family with two great boys to follow Nick's very significant footsteps, but also professionally as unswerving champions of freedom in spite of great personal risks that they endured in the Philippines.

As long time close personal friends from our days as conspiring Cadet Company Commanders at West Point in the great Class of 60, thru Ranger training where we paired as supporting buddies, as bachelor roommates when we dared to force ourselves into Special Forces as a group of 2d Lieutenants who really believed the Green Beret calling by another slain Freedom Fighter, President John F. Kennedy, I would submit that we are all here to pay tribute to another great American, not to

mourn Nick Rowe's physical loss, because he is not totally lost.

James Nicholas Rowe, Colonel, United States Army, a man who was passionate about everything he did, his family and the motto of the Green Beret "de oppresso liber", would far rather that we all celebrate his ultimate freedom, the liberation of that indomitable spirit from the oppression of mortal restrictions. I know he appreciates the presence of his West Point classmates and their families that helped organize this gathering, some of whom came from clear across the country to pay tribute; and especially the presence of so many Non-Commissioned Officers that Col. Rowe rightfully treasured as the "get it done" backbone such as Sgt. Dan Pitzer who shared the POW suffering and Sgt. Chu Chu Penn who tried to put some of that backbone in those Special Forces 2d Lieutenants (you at least succeeded with one of us Sgt. Penn).

To the officials of our government who interrupted very important busy schedules to be here, Col. Nick Rowe was one of the best damn soldiers and statesmen you ever had. Thank you, but please don't let this extremely powerful spirit for freedom go to waist. You have the power and the greatest organization in the world, the United States Government and U.S. Army to capitalize on it! I beg you to use this spirit of freedom as a tool, a club, even, to beat down the misguided will of oppressing guerillas such as those in the Philippines. Symbolize it to inspire the resolve in all men and women to not give up the fight for freedom whatever the risks. Institutionalize Nick Rowe's now finally free spirit!

The display of some of his POW things at the Camp McCall training facility for the Sere Course, a course Nick himself instituted taking advantage of his painfully learned skills in Survival-Evasion-Resistance-Escape, is just one small step to harness the power of his spirit.

As I am sure you all know, on the 21st of April, in a land being oppressed by rising communist guerrilla forces, Nick was removed from this mortal world the only way he could have been removed . . . in a para military fire fight, an ambush by reportedly hooded guerrillas. As he had written just the week before to a friend at Ft. Bragg, the home area of his true OAO, wife-partner Susan, and the special forces organization to whom he had passionately dedicated his considerable professional efforts, Nick and Susan knew he was on a target list.

A lesser man, a man without Nick's faith in God, without his so obviously cherished ideals of duty, honor, country; without his POW tested resolve to not let the bastards of this mortal world hold you down, might have been more conservative, but he pushed on. Susan was there in the Philippines with him, had just five months earlier given birth to their second son Brian Whitford Rowe, but risked the obvious guerrilla surveillance and threat to keep their family together. Susan fully supported his ideals and strong belief that the continued pursuit of freedom was worth the risk of life.

Nick, of course, well knew the meaning of freedom, especially having lost it so completely for over five years, 62 physically and mentally tortured months as a prisoner of war in the South Vietnam U-Minh Forest. He was mentally tortured not only by his capture but also by his captors showing him news from our great land on the lack of support from the vocal American minority. Just before his final successful escape, Nick was condemned to death when his cover story



was betrayed by some misguided so-called Americans that helped get his captors information on his real military status. They knew he was not "just an engineer" who knew only of bridges and such, not of military operations. They had no hope of breaking him.

As a tradition with us Texan's, the Cavalry arrived in the form of GunShips from the 1st Cavalry Division to help Nick distinguish himself as the only officer to successfully escape a prison camp in Vietnam, a typical Rowe example of perseverance for he had tried three times before, but never gave up in spite of the costs. The description of his fourth and final attempt to gain Freedom, in his book "Five Years to Freedom" was a real life thriller and tear-jerker that easily rivaled the best that Hollywood ever produced. You could literally feel him scrambling into that safe-haven of a helicopter. He knew what Freedom was worth! His values for family were equally eye-wetting for this tough Ranger buddy when I again read the end of this book, of his return to McAllen, Texas in the company of classmates D.K. Allen and Les Beavers to his Father and Mother. Nick got his faith from a mother who only asked, upon his return, what took him so long. For those few of you who have not gotten the message directly from his fantastic book, I strongly comment it to you. Susan also informed me that the book is being made into a play, the script partly done by Nick himself, but to be finished by Director and Playwrite Charles Wallace, naming it "Faith to Freedom" in honor of not just our Vietnam Veterans but as a "memorial to all men and women who have endured and sacrificed in the service to the United States as a "Nation".

Nick had left for work that last day in the Philippines, he was the Ground Forces Director of the Joint Military Advisory Group, very happily and with his never failing sense of humor, as Susan recalls, with his driver Juquin, after impishly waking Susan by letting his oldest son Alex (Stephen Alexander Rowe) barge into the bedroom while he quipped that if he had to be awake, why shouldn't she? As he rode he was probably thinking of the several speeches he was scheduled to present and an upcoming parachute jump, a thing he dearly loved with and without jump-pay. Nick was one of the pioneers of "HALO" parachuting techniques, High Altitude Low Opening, another somewhat risky endeavor but one that should ultimately save lives. He might also have been thinking about some traveling that he and Susan would finally get to do just for fun, when a barrage of bullets hit his car in which one managed to get inside the car, killing him instantly and wounding his driver. I am sure he is still mad as hell, that he couldn't fight back, but he will be even madder if we don't.

In one sense the assassin was merciful and in another very very foolish, but in no sense successful. Nick was definitely an old war-horse, older beyond his years, with more than his share of aches and pains, thanks to POW guards like those he named "Mafia" and "Porky". An attack of gallstones just before Brian was born and other such aftermaths of POW living were not exactly something anyone looked forward to. The foolishness though is another of the guerrillas misguided beliefs, that his mortal death would help their cause. American history and Nick's should have told them it would only strengthen the resolve of the freedom-loving people, especially the fortunate ones whose lives were touched by Nick personal-

ly; or touched by his books (he has two others in print: "The Judas Squad," a gripping fictional story about an armed takeover of a nuclear power plant, a story that too nearly could be true; and the "Washington Connection," which he co-authored with Robin Moore), or touched by his many, many speeches on how faith can get you through literally anything.

Nick Rowe is a true American champion of freedom and hero. We don't need to read a long list of medals. In the eyes of this friend and as I trust is acknowledged by the very presence of all of you here, you must share in this truth and the indomitable spirit that is and always will be Nick Rowe. You can read it in his written words, hear it and see it in both the many personal appearances and video tapes on POW/MIA matters or even in one of the civilian parts of his world campaigning against child abuse.

Freedom, and those who champion such a cause with such fervor, are to be cherished and celebrated, not mourned. Nick couldn't and wouldn't accept anything else. As much as I know they hurt from his physical loss, Susan, his boys, Deborah his first born by a previous marriage and her sister Christina, Nick would want them and all of us to dry our eyes, stand up straight and not be afraid to be counted in continuing his and our quest for freedom.

Nick was not the first to die for freedom, nor, unfortunately, will he be the last. But he definitely was the best I ever knew and I am so thankful he touched my life and left so much of himself for us all to continue with.

Please lets all keep his freedom spirit burning brightly wherever it is needed.

"... When our course on earth is run, may it be said well done, be thou at peace ..." old friend.

So, Mr. Speaker, that makes me humble and proud to have known a man of the quality of Nick Rowe. I would like to express my condolences to his family. He has two young children, as I recall, living.

Without Nick and people like him serving as role models for those of us who follow and those who will follow on in the military, this country will not achieve the greatness in the future that it has in the past were it not for Nick and people like him. We owe him an eternal debt of gratitude which we can never repay.

One way we can repay Nick and others like him is to not forget their memory and be always aware of the fact that there are people who are dedicated and giving their lives in the service of their country so that we can go about our ordinary daily pursuits and enjoy all the freedoms that we enjoy, to speak, to assemble, go to church or not go to church, all the freedoms that we have because people like Nick Rowe made the ultimate sacrifice to pay for our freedom that we enjoy today. Nick, we salute you.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their re-

marks and include therein extraneous material on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama Mr. [DICKINSON].

There was no objection.

#### INTRODUCTION OF CLEAN AIR FUEL CONVERSION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation that will establish the Federal Government as a leader in this country's evolution to cleaner fuels. The bill sets a schedule for converting portions of the Federal fleet to vehicles capable of running on alcohol, natural gas, or electricity.

Dozens of cities in this country are still in very serious violation of EPA's standards for safe air. My own home city of Sacramento is the 12th most polluted city in terms of ozone and the 14th worst for carbon monoxide. Current ozone levels are causing permanent scarring and premature aging of the lungs, worsening respiratory problems, and may be reducing resistance to infections. Children, because they play so vigorously outdoors, have been especially affected. High carbon monoxide levels are particularly harmful to people with heart conditions and may be harming fetuses during key developmental stages.

We don't have to put up with this, but changing it requires a willingness to plan and take active control of our future. One key strategy in reducing air pollution is to increase the proportion of vehicles on the road that run on cleaner fuels. Use of methanol, ethanol, natural gas, or electricity can dramatically reduce emissions of both carbon monoxide and the hydrocarbons that form ozone.

The Federal Government has an invaluable role to play in helping the country make this change, in part because of a chicken-and-egg problem: Consumers won't buy alternative fuel cars because the fuel is not for sale, and companies don't sell the fuel because there's no demand. This bill requires that the Government install alcohol or natural gas pumps to service its own fleet, where there are no commercial pumps available, and that the Government sell these fuels to the public, again until there are commercial suppliers. This way, the public can begin to get experience with these vehicles, and we will gradually create enough of a market to entice commercial fuel companies to install their own alcohol or natural gas pumps.

This bill is cost-effective in several ways. First, it only applies to Federal fleets located in areas with the worst air, where the ozone or carbon monoxide levels create a serious or severe risk to health. Second, those fleets are only required to be converted at the rate of 10 percent of the fleet per year, which is the normal rate of turnover for Federal vehicles anyway. Third, the requirement does not begin until 1993, by which time at least two of the major American auto manufacturers expect to

be producing some of these vehicles in commercial quantities, with the consequent price reductions. The long leadtime is important in giving the auto industry time to plan ways to meet this new demand; from the perspective of our major manufacturers, 1993 is tomorrow.

I appreciate the enthusiastic support of so many of my colleagues for this bill: Mr. SHARP has been involved and helpful from the beginning, and another 38 of our colleagues have joined as original cosponsors. The support is bipartisan and from every region of the country. Clearly, we share a desire to see the Federal Government use its great potential for leadership in an area so vital to the health and well-being of the public.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the bill in the RECORD at this point in its entirety.

H.R. 2175

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. REQUIRED USE IN NONATTAINMENT AREAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to any fleet of passenger automobiles and light-duty trucks owned or leased for more than 60 days by the United States for operation in an area designated under the Clean Air Act as an area of serious or severe health endangerment for ozone or carbon monoxide, or both—

(1) 10 percent of the vehicles of such fleet to be used in such area shall be alternative fuel vehicles after September 30, 1993;

(2) 20 percent of the vehicles of such fleet to be used in such area shall be alternative fuel vehicles after September 30, 1994;

(3) 30 percent of the vehicles of such fleet to be used in such area shall be alternative fuel vehicles after September 30, 1995;

(4) 40 percent of the vehicles of such fleet to be used in such area shall be alternative fuel vehicles after September 30, 1996;

(5) 50 percent of the vehicles of such fleet to be used in such area shall be alternative fuel vehicles after September 30, 1997;

(6) 60 percent of the vehicles of such fleet to be used in such area shall be alternative fuel vehicles after September 30, 1998;

(7) 70 percent of the vehicles of such fleet to be used in such area shall be alternative fuel vehicles after September 30, 1999;

(8) 80 percent of the vehicles of such fleet to be used in such area shall be alternative fuel vehicles after September 30, 2000;

(9) 90 percent of the vehicles of such fleet to be used in such area shall be alternative fuel vehicles after September 30, 2001; and

(10) 100 percent of the vehicles of such fleet to be used in such area shall be alternative fuel vehicles after September 30, 2002.

(b) REQUIRED OPERATION.—The Administrator of the General Services Administration and the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Energy shall, before October 1, 1992, issue regulations to ensure that a vehicle acquired pursuant to subsection (a)—

(1) shall be supplied with alcohol, natural gas or other gaseous hydrocarbons, or electricity, as appropriate, in its primary area of operation, using commercially available fueling facilities to the maximum extent practicable; and

(2) shall be operated exclusively on such fuel except when operated so as to make it impracticable to obtain such fuel.

(c) CONSIDERATIONS.—(1) Funds appropriated for carrying out this Act shall be applied on a priority basis, for expenditure

first in areas of the United States which the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency determines have the most severe air pollution problems.

(2) A Federal officer or agent responsible for deciding which types of alternative fuel vehicles to acquire in order to comply with subsection (a) shall consider as a factor in such decision which types of vehicles yield the greatest reduction in pollutants emitted per dollar spent.

(d) CONSULTATION.—A Federal officer or agent responsible for deciding which types of alternative fuel vehicles to acquire in order to comply with subsection (a) shall, on an expedited and informal basis, consult with the Environmental Protection Agency and with the lead State or local agency charged with air quality planning for the area in which the vehicles will be operated. The purpose of such consultation shall be to obtain relevant information—

(1) with respect to considerations under subsection (c)(2); and

(2) to facilitate the coordination of this Act with other Federal, State, and local programs, such as any plans by a State to install alternative fuel pumps near a location where vehicles acquired under subsection (a) will be operated.

(e) AVAILABILITY TO THE PUBLIC.—At Federal facilities where vehicles acquired under subsection (a) are supplied with alcohol or natural gas or other gaseous hydrocarbons, such fuel shall be offered for sale to the public for use in other vehicles, unless—

(1) such fuel is commercially available for vehicles in the vicinity of such Federal facilities;

(2) security considerations prevent the offering for sale of such fuel at such facility; or

(3) the area served by the facility comes into full compliance with the national ambient air quality standards for ozone and carbon monoxide.

(f) COST OF VEHICLES TO FEDERAL AGENCY.—(1) Funds appropriated under this Act for the acquisition of vehicles under subsection (a) shall be applicable only—

(A) to the portion of the cost of vehicles acquired under subsection (a) which exceeds the cost of comparable conventional fueled vehicles;

(B) to the portion of the costs of fuel storage and dispensing equipment attributable to such vehicles which exceeds the costs for such purposes required for conventional fuel vehicles; and

(C) to the portion of the costs of operating and maintaining such vehicles which exceeds the costs for such purposes required for comparable conventional fueled vehicles.

(2) The Secretary of Energy shall ensure that the cost to any Federal agency receiving a vehicle under subsection (a) shall not exceed the cost to such agency of a comparable conventional fueled vehicle.

(g) EXEMPTION.—The incremental cost of vehicles acquired under subsection (a) over the cost of comparable conventional fueled vehicles shall not be applied to any calculation with respect to a limitation under law on the maximum cost of individual vehicles which may be acquired by the United States.

(h) FLEET AVERAGE FUEL ECONOMY.—In any calculation of the average fuel economy of the fleet of passenger automobiles acquired in a fiscal year by the United States, vehicles acquired under subsection (a) shall be measured in terms of miles per BTU or per kilowatt hour, as appropriate.

(i) STUDIES.—Vehicles acquired under subsection (a) may be included in any Federal

Government study of the environmental effects or military applications of vehicles operated on natural gas or other gaseous hydrocarbons, alcohol fuels, or electricity.

#### SEC. 2. OPERATION OF OTHER FEDERAL VEHICLES.

A gasoline powered vehicle operated in an area designated under the Clean Air Act as a nonattainment area for carbon monoxide which is not a dual energy vehicle or a natural gas dual energy vehicle shall, after March 31, 1990, be supplied with fuel which blends oxygenates with gasoline at its primary fueling facility. Such vehicle shall be operated exclusively on such fuel except when operated—

(1) so as to make it impracticable to obtain such fuel; or

(2) in an area during any month in which such area is a nonattainment area for ozone under the Clean Air Act, unless the Administrator determines that the use of blended fuel in those months would improve air quality.

#### SEC. 3. EXEMPTIONS.

The requirements of section 1(a) of this Act shall not apply to vehicles—

(1) being operated as an experiment in the use of alternative fuels other than alcohol, natural gas or other gaseous hydrocarbons, or electricity; or

(2) with respect to which the Secretary of Defense has claimed an exemption based on national security considerations.

#### SEC. 4. INSTALLATION OF UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE EQUIPMENT.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Any underground storage tank, along with all associated underground piping or underground equipment, installed or replaced at a designated federal facility after July 1, 1990, shall be capable of safely storing alcohol.

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term "designated Federal facility" means any Federal facility where passenger automobiles or light-duty trucks owned or leased by the Federal Government are supplied with fuel, if such facility is an area designated under the Clean Air Act as an area of serious or severe health endangerment for ozone or carbon monoxide.

#### SEC. 5. AIR QUALITY AND HEALTH STUDY.

(a) COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS.—The Administrator, in cooperation with the Department of Energy National Laboratories, shall prepare a comprehensive analysis with respect to the air pollutant emission, air quality impact, and human health risks, including toxicity to consumers at self-service fuel pumps, associated with the storage, distribution, and use of significant amounts of alcohols or natural gas or other gaseous hydrocarbons as transportation fuels as compared to diesel and gasoline fuels. The Administrator shall include an analysis of the usefulness of alcohols, natural gas or other gaseous hydrocarbons, and electricity as substitute transportation fuels to assist areas of the United States in attaining national ambient air quality standards prescribed under section 109 of the Clean Air Act.

(b) REPORT.—The Administrator shall, before October 1, 1992, submit a report to the Congress detailing the results of the comprehensive analysis prepared under subsection (a).

(c) FUNDING.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of this section \$975,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991.

#### SEC. 6. DEFINITIONS AND CRITERIA.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this Act—



(1) the term "acquired" means purchased or leased for a period of 60 days or more;

(2) the term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency;

(3) the term "alcohol" means a mixture containing 85 percent or more methanol, ethanol, or other alcohols by volume;

(4) the term "alternative fuel vehicle" means a dual energy vehicle, a natural gas dual energy vehicle, a dedicated alcohol vehicle, a dedicated natural gas vehicle, or an electric vehicle;

(5) the term "dedicated alcohol vehicle" means a vehicle designed to operate exclusively on alcohol;

(6) the term "dedicated natural gas vehicle" means a vehicle designed to operate exclusively on natural gas or other gaseous hydrocarbons;

(7) the term "dual energy vehicle" means a vehicle which—

(A) is capable of operating on alcohol and on conventional fuel;

(B) provides equal or superior energy efficiency, as calculated during fuel economy testing for the Federal Government, while operating on alcohol as it does while operating on conventional fuel; and

(C) meets the criteria set forth in subsection (b);

(8) the term "electric vehicle" means any vehicle capable of operating exclusively on energy derived from a source of electricity, including batteries capable of being charged by electric current, solar energy, and any other source of electricity;

(9) the term "natural gas dual energy vehicle" means a vehicle which—

(A) is capable of operating on natural gas or other gaseous hydrocarbons and on conventional fuel;

(B) provides equal or superior energy efficiency, as calculated during fuel economy testing by the Federal Government, while operating on natural gas or other gaseous hydrocarbons as it does while operating on conventional fuel; and

(C) meets the criteria set forth in subsection (b); and

(10) the term "vicinity" means an area the Secretary of Energy determines to be the area a commercial supplier of alcohol or natural gas or other gaseous hydrocarbon fuels would reasonably expect to serve.

(b) **CRITERIA FOR VEHICLES.**—No vehicle shall be considered an alternative fuel vehicle under this section unless the vehicle meets each of the following criteria:

(1) The emission rates for air pollutants, designated by the Administrator, emitted from such vehicle are less than those for comparable vehicles which do not use such alternate fuels.

(2) The vehicle emits formaldehyde at a level no greater than that which the Administrator determines to be appropriate for the protection of the public health.

#### SEC. 7. FUNDING.

There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, \$10,000,000; for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, \$7,000,000; for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, \$7,000,000; and for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, \$5,000,000, to carry out the purposes of this Act except for the study under section 5. The authority of the Secretary to obligate amounts authorized under this Act shall be effective for any fiscal year only to the extent provided in advance by appropriation Acts.

□ 1510

#### PUERTO RICO STATUS LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the Virgin Islands [Mr. DE LUGO] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, Puerto Rico's commonwealth relationship with the United States was established from 1950 to 1952 by a series of acts by Congress and the President and the people of Puerto Rico.

The relationship was always intended to be dynamic and adjustable in response to changed circumstances.

The expanded role of the Federal Government in society, changed economic realities, and desires for increased local authority have led to initiatives to develop the commonwealth relationship during the past three decades.

At the same time, some Puerto Ricans have advocated making the commonwealth a State or an independent nation.

During the last Congress, the ranking Republican of the Subcommittee on Insular and International Affairs, our colleague BOB LAGOMARSINO, and other Members introduced a bill to provide for a referendum in Puerto Rico on statehood. It included a process for developing implementing legislation.

This bill was sponsored, in part, in response to a large number of petitions from Puerto Ricans and requests from some local officials.

Also in the last Congress, our colleague RON DELLUMS and other Members sponsored legislation which would have essentially provided independence—and, possibly, free association—for Puerto Rico.

Independence also has some support among Puerto Ricans.

Although I did not schedule action on either bill, as chairman of the Insular and International Affairs Subcommittee, I developed amendments to the Lagomarsino bill. The amendments were developed in consultation with both the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO] and the distinguished Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, JAIME FUSTER.

The amended bill would have provided for a choice between statehood; independence; and improving the commonwealth relationship, the option favored by the commonwealth's elected leaders.

Key statehood and enhanced commonwealth leaders seemed to be interested in the amendments. But the consensus I felt necessary for action was not developed. This may have been due to the impending elections last November.

The elections kept Governor Rafael Hernandez Colon, who favors enhancing commonwealth, in office as well as

like-minded majorities in the legislature.

After the elections, the Governor consulted me on the possibility of legislation akin to what I developed earlier.

The Governor also had similar discussions with the chairman of our counterpart committee in the other body, the Honorable J. BENNETT JOHNSTON, Jr., and with Andrew Card, who had been Executive Director of the White House Task Force on Puerto Rico in the last administration, and is now Deputy to the Chief of Staff in the White House.

After receiving our indications of support, the Governor proposed in his inaugural address that Congress consult the people of Puerto Rico and act on their choice between enhancing commonwealth, statehood, and independence.

This initiative was joined soon afterwards by the heads of parties favoring statehood and independence.

I regarded a joint letter to the Congress making this proposal from the Governor, as head of the Popular Democratic Party; our former colleague Baltasar Corrada, as head of the statehood-favoring New Progressive Party, and former Senator Rueben Berrios, as head of the Independence Party, as a historic and patriotic act.

The leaders of Puerto Rico's various status movements have long disagreed on the process for resolving the divisive debate on the commonwealth's future political status.

The differences have effectively prevented action on many of the needs of the 3.3 million Americans of Puerto Rico. This is to the extent that Puerto Rico's needs receive less attention than those of any other member of the American political family. I have met with the leaders of each of the parties since receiving the letter. Ranking Republican LAGOMARSINO and the chairman of the full committee, our colleague MO UDALL, have had similar meetings.

Although the process of developing the requested legislation was delayed somewhat by former Governor Carlos Romero Barcelo replacing Baltasar Corrada as president of the New Progressive Party, it is progressing.

It received encouragement when President Bush, who has long supported statehood, expressed his support for a choice between the statuses in his February 9 address to the joint session of Congress. It was advanced by meetings with the Puerto Rican party leaders that Chairman JOHNSTON has conducted.

These meetings led to the introduction by Chairman JOHNSTON and the ranking republican of the Senate committee, the Honorable JAMES A. MCCLURE, of three alternative bills.

They would provide for a local choice between enhancing commonwealth, statehood, and independence. They also provide for implementing the favored development in the Federal-commonwealth relationship.

These bills, and an aggressive process for fully developing them, are outlined in the RECORD of April 5.

Initially, I had also intended to introduce legislation on this very sensitive subject after consultations with the leaders of the three parties in Puerto Rico. I have not introduced any legislation on it yet, however, because the bills introduced in the Senate are generally consistent with what I had suggested, and to avert confusion in Puerto Rico.

Chairman JOHNSTON has kept me informed on his work on this matter and we have spoken a few times about it. I intend to cooperate with him to the extent possible on it.

I plan similar cooperation with Resident Commissioner FUSTER and Puerto Rico's other leaders and ranking Republican LAGOMARSINO and other interested Members.

My intent is that the Insular and International Affairs Subcommittee's role in the development and consideration of this important legislation will be constructive to the process. I hope that it will help resolve Puerto Rico's status dilemma.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ENGEL (at the request of Mr. FOLEY), for today, on account of official business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Mississippi) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials:)

Mr. DICKINSON, for 60 minutes, today and 60 minutes, on May 3.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. McEWEN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SWIFT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials:)

Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FAZIO, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. FORD of Michigan, for 60 minutes, on May 3.

Mr. DINGELL, for 60 minutes, on May 4.

Mr. SCHUMER, for 60 minutes, on May 9.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his re-

marks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DE LUGO, for 10 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Mississippi) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BOELHERT.

Mr. GREEN.

Mr. CHANDLER.

Mr. GRADISON in two instances.

Mr. BROOMFIELD in two instances.

Mr. VANDER JAGT.

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. SMITH of Texas.

Mr. DOUGLAS.

Mr. GALLO.

Mr. SCHUETTE.

Mrs. MORELLA in two instances.

Mrs. ROUKEMA.

Mr. SHUSTER.

Mr. COURTER.

Mr. DORNAN of California.

Ms. SNOWE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SWIFT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ASPIN.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.

Mr. RICHARDSON.

Ms. PELOSI.

Mr. SKELTON in two instances.

Mr. FLORIO.

Mr. TORRES.

Mr. DONNELLY.

Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. FUSTER.

Mr. HOYER.

Mr. SABO.

Mr. LELAND.

Mr. MATSUI in two instances.

Mr. SMITH of Florida.

Mr. ROE.

Mr. PANETTA.

Mr. LANCASTER.

Mr. BRUCE.

Mr. DYSON in two instances.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas.

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 678. An act to make a correction in the Education and Training for a Competitive America Act of 1988.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 3, 1989, at 12 noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1097. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations and Logistics), transmitting notification of the emergency disposal of 14 suspected chemical 155mm munitions at the North Wig and Cedar Mountain areas of Dugway Proving Ground, UT, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1518; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1098. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting their annual report on the activities undertaken during 1988 on the problems relating to homelessness, pursuant to Public Law 100-77, section 203(c)(1) (101 Stat. 4870; Public Law 100-628, section 205 (102 Stat. 3228); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1099. A letter from the Executive Director, District of Columbia Retirement Board, transmitting financial disclosure statements of Board members for calendar year 1988, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-732, 1-734(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1100. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a copy of the report "Management of Hazardous Wastes From Educational Institutions," pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 6921 nt.; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1101. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting notification of a proposed authorization for the export of defense articles sold commercially to the Government of Japan (Transmittal No. MC-9-89), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1102. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a copy of the 1988 annual report of the Office of the U.S. Courts, bound together with the reports of the proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held during 1988, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 604(a)(4) and (h)(2); 28 U.S.C. 2412(d)(5); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1103. A letter from the Treasurer General, Daughters of the American Revolution, transmitting the report of the audit of the Society for the fiscal year ended February 28, 1989, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(20), 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1104. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs; transmitting a copy of the report entitled "Citizens' Self-Defense Groups in the Philippines"; jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Affairs.

1105. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting copies of the fiscal year 1990 budget requests of the Federal Aviation Administration to the Department, including requests for "Facilities and equipment" and "Research, engineering, and development," pursuant to 49 U.S.C. app. 2205(f); jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Science, Space, and Technology.



## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PANETTA: Committee on the Budget. House Concurrent Resolution 106. Resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1990, 1991, and 1992 (Rept. No. 101-42). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FROST: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 143. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 7, a bill to amend the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act to extend the authorities contained in such act through the fiscal year 1995 (Rept. 101-43). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DERRICK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 145. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 106, Budget for United States Government for fiscal years 1990, 1991, and 1992 (Rept. 101-45). Referred to the House Calendar.

## REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. SWIFT: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 1326. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Federal Election Commission for fiscal year 1990, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Government Operations for a period ending not later than June 2, 1989, for consideration of such provisions of the bill as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(i), rule X (Rept. 101-44, Pt. I). Ordered to be printed.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLAY (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. GILMAN):

H.R. 2168. A bill to prevent potential abuses of electronic monitoring in the workplace; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOEHLERT:

H.R. 2169. A bill to increase for fiscal year 1989 the obligation ceiling for airport grants-in-aid; jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. BUECHNER:

H.R. 2170. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the Rules of the House of Representatives to extend cost estimates contained in committee reports accompanying legislation from 5 years to 10 years; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DYSON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HOYER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MFUME, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. TRAFICANT):

H.R. 2171. A bill to revitalize the United States steel industry; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DONNELLY (for himself, Mr. FAUNTROY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PETRI, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. FAZIO, Mrs. COLLINS, and Mr. OLIN):

H.R. 2172. A bill to revoke most-favored-nation treatment from the products of foreign countries that do not prohibit international trading in ivory and ivory products, to deny foreign tax credits with respect to income derived from the processing of, or trading in, ivory, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLISH:

H.R. 2173. A bill to extend disaster assistance to losses due to adverse weather conditions in 1988 or 1989 for those crops planted in 1988 for harvest in 1989; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ESPY (for himself, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BEVILL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DYALLY, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. PARKER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PENNY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. ROE, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SMITH of Mississippi, Mr. TAUZIN, and Mr. WHEAT):

H.R. 2174. A bill to establish a commission to prepare a report on the feasibility of creating a Mississippi River National Heritage Corridor; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FAZIO (for himself, Mr. SHARP, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. UDALL, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. FRANK, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. PENNY, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MINETA, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. FISH, Mr. FROST, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. FAUNTROY):

H.R. 2175. A bill requiring the use by the Federal Government of certain vehicles capable of operating on alcohol or natural gas fuels or on electricity in areas not in compliance with the Clean Air Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 2176. A bill relating to the negotiation of customs preclearance agreements with foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GORDON:

H.R. 2177. A bill to promote local awareness of asbestos disposal by requiring asbes-

tos removers to notify designated State and local officials of the disposal date, origin, amount, and location of asbestos being disposed of in their jurisdiction; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 2178. A bill to designate lock and dam numbered 4 on the Arkansas River, Arkansas, as the "Emmett Sanders Lock and Dam;" to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 2179. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that the disease of transverse myelitis occurring in a veteran within 7 years from the date of the veteran's discharge or release from active duty shall be considered to be service-connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 2180. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the tax benefits related to certain personal injury liability assignments shall apply to assignments to make periodic payments for all categories of excludable compensation for injuries or sickness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER (for himself and Mr. MOORHEAD) (both by request):

H.R. 2181. A bill to restore lost compensation and establish the procedure for adjusting future compensation of justices and judges of the United States; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOLTER:

H.R. 2182. A bill to establish a temporary program of supplemental unemployment benefits for unemployed coal miners who have exhausted their rights to regular unemployment benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LELAND (for himself and Mr. HORTON):

H.R. 2183. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to limit the rate of pay at which the Postal Service may compensate experts and consultants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 2184. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit certain practices involving commercial uses of telephone facsimile machines; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MATSUI (for himself, Mr. DOWNEY, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. STARK, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. DYALLY, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. BONIOR, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 2185. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to make necessary improvements in the foster care and adoption assistance program with the objective of assuring that such program will more realistically and more effectively meet the needs of the children involved, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas (for herself, Mr. WHEAT, and Mr. WELDON):

H.R. 2186. A bill to require that Federal, State, and regional enclaves permit certain emergency response personnel to conduct pre-incident planning activities, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. COELHO, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. GRANT, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. TALLON, and Mr. ESPY):

H.R. 2187. A bill to enable producers of fresh mushrooms to develop, finance, and carry out a nationally coordinated program for fresh mushroom promotion, research, and consumer information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. ESPY, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. PORTER, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. EVANS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. DE LUGO, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. CONTE):

H.R. 2188. A bill to establish programs to improve foreign language instruction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PEASE:

H.R. 2189. A bill to provide for comprehensive campaign reform with respect to elections for the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration, Energy and Commerce, Post Office and Civil Service, and Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. COELHO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GUNDERSON, and Mr. SWIFT):

H.R. 2190. A bill to establish national voter registration procedures for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. LENT, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. MANTON):

H.R. 2191. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore the tax-exempt status of Blue Cross and Blue Shield companies which cover high-risk individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.R. 2192. A bill to amend chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the time period during which benefits under such chapter may be utilized by certain eligible veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ROUKEMA:

H.R. 2193. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to reduce the costs to the Federal Government from defaults on federally assisted student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SABO:

H.R. 2194. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for public financing of House of Representatives general election campaigns, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration and Ways and Means.

By Ms. SNOWE:

H.R. 2195. A bill to amend the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act of 1988 to

extend the Advisory Committee on Medicare Home Health Claims; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SUNDQUIST:

H.R. 2196. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, regarding sentencing for capital offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2197. A bill to provide for additional contingent termination liability for the Advanced Solid Rocket Motor Program; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mrs. VUCANOVICH:

H.R. 2198. A bill to transfer the parcel known as the Battle Mountain Community Pasture, located in Lander County, NV; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOEHLERT:

H.J. Res. 253. Joint resolution designating September 8, 1989, as "National Pledge of Allegiance Day;" to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LEVINE of California (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. COELHO, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. MINETA, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. ECKART, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. ROSE, Mr. FRANK, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. BATES, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PEASE, Mr. McNULTY and Mr. SANGMEISTER):

H.J. Res. 254. Joint resolution to prohibit the U.S. Government approval of the manufacturing license agreement relating to the design, development, and production of a model FSX aircraft in Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. OAKAR (for herself and Mr. LEWIS of Florida):

H.J. Res. 255. A joint resolution designating February 18 through 24, 1990, as "National Visiting Nurse Associations Week;" to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WYDEN:

H.J. Res. 256. A joint resolution to designate the week beginning October 8, 1989, as "National Infertility Awareness Week;" to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McEWEN (for himself, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. BILLRAKIS, Mr. LENT, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. CONTE, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HILER, Mr. GALLO, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. HERGER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. DeWINE, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. HYDE, Mr. WEBER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. SHAW, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. GRADISON, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. GINGRICH):

H. Res. 144. Resolution condemning the use of excessive and lethal force by Soviet troops against demonstrators in Soviet Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. MATSUI introduced a bill (H.R. 2199) for the relief of You Wah Lee; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 8: Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. FISH, and Mr. DARDEN.

H.R. 22: Mr. BARNARD.

H.R. 29: Mr. DANNEMEYER and Mr. HENRY.

H.R. 41: Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. WALGREN, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 71: Mr. FIELDS.

H.R. 91: Mr. CLEMENT.

H.R. 118: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 169: Mr. HANCOCK.

H.R. 237: Mr. GEJDENSON and Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 240: Mrs. SAIKI.

H.R. 286: Mr. COELHO.

H.R. 290: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. GUARINI, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. STARK, Mr. MOODY, Mr. WEISS, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 369: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. WEBER, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. GRANDY.

H.R. 423: Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH and Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 586: Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 596: Mr. COX.

H.R. 614: Mr. RUSSO, Mr. SAVAGE, and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H.R. 638: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FUSTER, and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 639: Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. STOKES, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, and Mr. WALGREN.

H.R. 645: Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 682: Mr. CRAIG and Mr. HUTTO.

H.R. 691: Mr. ATKINS.

H.R. 766: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. FRANK, Mr. MRAZEK, and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 775: Mr. WEISS and Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

H.R. 800: Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. WISE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. COYNE, and Mr. CROCKETT.

H.R. 814: Mr. WISE, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 833: Mr. WISE.

H.R. 854: Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. WISE, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. OLIN, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. COYNE, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. DE LUGO.

H.R. 866: Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. ATKINS.

H.R. 867: Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. ATKINS.

H.R. 868: Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ATKINS, and Mr. TAUKE.

H.R. 895: Mr. MILLER of Washington.

H.R. 923: Mr. BROOKS.

H.R. 930: Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. SCHUMER.



H.R. 937: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. HYDE, Mr. PARKER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. ESPY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. COURTER, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. HORTON, Mr. FAZIO, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. WILSON, Mr. LELAND, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. WOLPE, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 939: Mr. RAVENEL and Mr. FAUNTROY.  
H.R. 963: Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 982: Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

H.R. 987: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. SMITH of Vermont, Mr. MACHTELEY, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. RINALDO, and Mr. PERKINS.

H.R. 993: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mr. AKAKA.

H.R. 995: Mr. PEPPER.

H.R. 1030: Mr. STUDDS.

H.R. 1078: Mr. KOLBE and Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.R. 1086: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. HEFNER, and Mr. PARKER.

H.R. 1117: Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 1124: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. STUDDS, and Mr. FAUNTROY.

H.R. 1180: Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 1190: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. LELAND, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 1206: Mr. ROBINSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.R. 1212: Mr. McCURDY, Mr. MACHTELEY, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. FAUNTROY.

H.R. 1267: Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

H.R. 1277: Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. ATKINS, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1280: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 1292: Mr. CLEMENT.

H.R. 1401: Mr. SHUMWAY.

H.R. 1406: Mr. GRANDY.

H.R. 1416: Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. WILSON, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. RHODES, Mr. HENRY, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. FRANK, Mr. McCRERY, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. GREEN, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. CONTE, Mr. VENTO, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. HALL of Ohio.

H.R. 1425: Mr. ECKART.

H.R. 1452: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 1468: Mr. KOLTER and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.R. 1476: Mr. OXLEY, Mr. KASICH, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. McEWEN, and Mr. KOSTMAYER.

H.R. 1493: Mr. GARCIA and Mr. SAVAGE.

H.R. 1494: Mr. CROCKETT.

H.R. 1515: Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 1540: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 1544: Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 1584: Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HATCHER, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1589: Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

H.R. 1602: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CONTE, Mr. PARKER, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1605: Mr. EVANS, Mr. NELSON of Florida, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 1618: Mr. PASHAYAN.

H.R. 1867: Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 1870: Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BAKER, Mr. DANNEMEYER, and Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 1922: Mr. PETRI and Mr. MONTGOMERY.

H.R. 2042: Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. GRANDY.

H.R. 2145: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LENT, Mr. LEVINE of California, and Mr. MANTON.

H.J. Res. 24: Mr. BARTLETT.

H.J. Res. 30: Mr. MR. LIVINGSTON.

H.J. Res. 34: Mr. SWIFT.

H.J. Res. 68: Mr. WISE, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. RAY, Mr. MRAZEK, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. STOKES, Mr. COYNE, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. MFUME, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. WELDON.

H.J. Res. 104: Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. UPTON.

H.J. Res. 120: Mr. AU COIN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. OBEY, Mr. TAUZIN, and Mr. YATES.

H.J. Res. 177: Mr. FROST, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN.

H.J. Res. 204: Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.J. Res. 221: Mr. APPELGATE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. PARKER, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. ROBINSON, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.J. Res. 231: Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. MANTON, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LELAND, Mr. DYMALLY, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.J. Res. 240: Mr. CONTE, Mr. ESPY, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. SIKORSKI, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, and Mr. SOLARZ.

H.J. Res. 247: Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. GALLO, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. WILSON, Mr. INHOPE, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. MACHTELEY, Mr. RHODES, Mr. WELDON, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HENRY, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. HERGER, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. COX, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. TALLON, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. SMITH of Vermont, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. HILER, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. GOSS, Mr. PARKER, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. ESPY.

H. Con. Res. 6: Mr. COURTER.

H. Con. Res. 40: Mr. HAYES of Louisiana and Mr. SHUSTER.

H. Con. Res. 73: Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H. Con. Res. 77: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. DARDEN, and Mr. ATKINS.

H. Con. Res. 102: Mr. SMITH of Mississippi, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. ROSE, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. PARKER.

H. Con. Res. 105: Mr. MACHTELEY.

H. Res. 95: Mr. ATKINS.

H. Res. 129: Mr. MFUME, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mrs. PATTERSON.

H. Res. 130: Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. MINETA, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. TORRES, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. FAUNTROY, and Mr. LEVINE of California.

H. Res. 137: Mr. SKEEN, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

## AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H. CON. RES. 106

By: Mr. KASICH

(Amendment in the nature of a substitute.)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That the budget for fiscal year 1990 is established, and the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1991 and 1992 are hereby set forth.

### MAXIMUM DEFICIT AMOUNTS

SEC. 2. The following levels and amounts in this section are set forth for purposes of determining, in accordance with section 301(i) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, as amended by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, whether the maximum deficit amount for a fiscal year has been exceeded, and as set forth in this concurrent resolution, shall be considered to be mathematically consistent with the other amounts and levels set forth in this concurrent resolution:

(1) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1990: \$1,065,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1991: \$1,144,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1992: \$1,216,500,000,000.

(2) The appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1990: \$1,333,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1991: \$1,452,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1992: \$1,526,100,000,000.

(3) The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1990: \$1,156,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1991: \$1,215,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1992: \$1,258,500,000,000.

(4) The amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1990: \$91,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1991: \$70,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 1992: \$42,000,000,000.

### RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 3. (a) The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1989, October 1, 1990, and October 1, 1991:

(1) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1990: \$776,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1991: \$831,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 1992: \$884,400,000,000.

and the amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 1990: \$5,300,000.

Fiscal year 1991: \$5,300,000.

Fiscal year 1992: \$5,300,000.

and the amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for hospital insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1990: \$69,925,000,000.

Fiscal year 1991: \$75,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1992: \$79,900,000,000.

(2) The appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1990: \$1,021,550,000,000.

Fiscal year 1991: \$1,111,750,000,000.

Fiscal year 1992: \$1,156,775,000,000.

(3) The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1990: \$912,925,000,000.

Fiscal year 1991: \$953,250,000,000.

Fiscal year 1992: \$979,350,000,000.

(4) The amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1990: \$136,625,000,000.

Fiscal year 1991: \$121,450,000,000.

Fiscal year 1992: \$94,950,000,000.

(5) The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1990: \$3,122,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 1991: \$3,374,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1992: \$3,599,700,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1989, October 1, 1990, and October 1, 1991, are as follows:

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New direct loan obligations, \$19,025,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$107,325,000,000.

Fiscal year 1991:

(A) New direct loan obligations, \$19,425,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$114,875,000,000.

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New direct loan obligations, \$19,150,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$119,700,000,000.

(b) The Congress hereby determines and declares the appropriate levels of budget authority and budget outlays, and the appropriate levels of new direct loan obligations and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1990 through 1992 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, \$298,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$297,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1991:

(A) New budget authority, \$313,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$307,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, \$326,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$318,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,775,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,425,000,000.

Fiscal year 1991:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,800,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,675,000,000.

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,850,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,950,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1991:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,000,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1991:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$4,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$4,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,250,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$50,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1991:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$75,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$75,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,050,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$5,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1991:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,225,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$5,475,000,000.

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$15,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$9,675,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$5,425,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$8,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,200,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$60,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1991:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,300,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$66,350,000,000.

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,375,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$69,625,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$28,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$50,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1991:

(A) New budget authority, \$29,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$29,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$50,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$30,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$50,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):

Fiscal year 1990:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,000,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1991:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,050,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$525,000,000.

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,200,000,000.



(B) Outlays, \$6,800,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,100,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$550,000,000.  
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):  
 Fiscal year 1990:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,000,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,100,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$25,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$13,125,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 1991:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,600,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$25,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$13,550,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 1992:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,900,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$39,400,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$25,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$13,850,000,000.  
 (11) Health (550):  
 Fiscal year 1990:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,000,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$55,800,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$375,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 1991:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$62,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$61,300,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$400,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 1992:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$68,400,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$67,200,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$400,000,000.  
 (12) Medicare (570):  
 Fiscal year 1990:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$123,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$95,900,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 1991:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$135,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,700,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 1992:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$147,900,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$122,200,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 (13) Income Security (600):  
 Fiscal year 1990:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$184,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$145,400,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$50,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 1991:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$216,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$154,900,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$50,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 1992:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$219,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$163,700,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$50,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 (14) Social Security (650):  
 Fiscal year 1990:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,450,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,425,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 1991:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,250,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$4,250,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 1992:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,975,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$4,950,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):  
 Fiscal year 1990:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$29,500,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$825,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$21,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 1991:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$31,100,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$750,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$21,900,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 1992:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$32,200,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$700,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$22,900,000,000.  
 (16) Administration of Justice (750):  
 Fiscal year 1990:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$9,700,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 1991:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$11,200,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 1992:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$11,700,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 (17) General Government (800):  
 Fiscal year 1990:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,000,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$9,700,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 1991:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,400,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$10,200,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, \$10,900,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$10,200,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 (19) Net Interest (900):  
 Fiscal year 1990:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$180,900,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$180,900,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 1991:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$189,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$189,800,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 1992:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$193,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$193,800,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 (20) Allowances (920):  
 Fiscal year 1990:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$19,300,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 1991:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$47,200,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 1992:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$67,900,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New Primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 (21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):  
 Fiscal year 1990:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$37,400,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$44,600,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 1991:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$40,400,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$40,700,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 1992:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$41,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$41,800,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

## SENSE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

SEC. 4. It is the intent of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives that—

(1) Congress shall present the revenue portion of the reconciliation bill to the President at the same time as the spending reduction provisions of the reconciliation bill; and

(2) the specific measures composing the governmental receipts figure will be determined through the regular legislative and constitutional process, and agreements reached between the administration and the

Committee on Ways and Means on revenue legislation reconciled pursuant to this agreement will be advanced legislatively when supported by the President of the United States.

#### RECONCILIATION

SEC. 5. (a) Not later than June 30, 1989, the committees named in subsections (b) and (c) of this section shall submit their recommendations to the Committees on the Budget of their respective Houses. After receiving those recommendations, the Committees on the Budget shall report to the House and Senate a reconciliation bill or resolution or both carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

#### HOUSE COMMITTEES

(b)(1) The House Committee on Agriculture shall report (A) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (B) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, or (C) any combination thereof, as follows: \$1,172,000,000 in budget authority and \$1,092,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1990, \$0 in budget authority and \$1,172,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1991, and \$1,092,000,000 in budget authority and \$0 in outlays in fiscal year 1992.

(2) The House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs shall report (A) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (B) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, or (C) any combination thereof, as follows: \$0 in budget authority and \$587,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1990, \$0 in budget authority and \$587,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1991, and \$0 in budget authority and \$587,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1992.

(3) The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report (A) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (B) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, or (C) any combination thereof, as follows: \$399,000,000 in budget authority and \$2,699,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1990, \$399,000,000 in budget authority and \$2,699,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1991, and \$399,000,000 in budget authority and \$2,699,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1992.

(4) The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall report (A) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (B) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, or (C) any combination thereof, as follows: \$399,000,000 in budget authority and

\$399,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1990, \$399,000,000 in budget authority and \$399,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1991, and \$399,000,000 in budget authority and \$399,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1992.

(5) The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall report (A) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (B) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, or (C) any combination thereof, as follows: \$200,000,000 in budget authority and \$200,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1990, \$200,000,000 in budget authority and \$200,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1991, and \$200,000,000 in budget authority and \$200,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1992.

(6) The House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shall report (A) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (B) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, or (C) any combination thereof, as follows: \$0 in budget authority and \$1,100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1990, \$0 in budget authority and \$1,100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1991, and \$0 in budget authority and \$1,100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1992.

(7) The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report (A) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (B) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, or (C) any combination thereof, as follows: \$445,000,000 in budget authority and \$678,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1990, \$0 in budget authority and \$445,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1991, and \$678,000,000 in budget authority and \$445,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1992.

(8)(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report (i) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (ii) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, or (iii) any combination thereof, as follows: \$0 in budget authority and \$4,950,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1990, \$0 in budget authority and \$4,950,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1991, and \$0 in budget authority and \$4,950,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1992.

(B) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase revenues as follows: \$5,300,000,000 in fiscal year 1990, \$5,300,000,000 in fiscal year 1991, and \$5,300,000,000 in fiscal year 1992.

#### SENATE COMMITTEES

(c)(1) The Senate Committee on Agriculture shall report (A) changes in laws within

its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (B) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, or (C) any combination thereof, as follows: \$1,172,000,000 in budget authority and \$1,092,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1990, \$1,172,000,000 in budget authority and \$1,092,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1991, and \$1,172,000,000 in budget authority and \$1,092,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1992.

(2) The Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs shall report (A) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (B) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, or (C) any combination thereof, as follows: \$50,000,000 in budget authority and \$637,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1990, \$50,000,000 in budget authority and \$637,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1991, and \$50,000,000 in budget authority and \$637,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1992.

(3) The Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation shall report (A) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (B) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, or (C) any combination thereof, as follows: \$250,000,000 in budget authority and \$250,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1990, \$250,000,000 in budget authority and \$250,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1991, and \$250,000,000 in budget authority and \$250,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1992.

(4) The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works shall report (A) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (B) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, or (C) any combination thereof, as follows: \$299,000,000 in budget authority and \$299,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1990, \$299,000,000 in budget authority and \$299,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1991, and \$299,000,000 in budget authority and \$299,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1992.

(5) The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources shall report (A) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (B) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, or (C) any combination thereof, as follows: \$100,000,000 in budget authority and \$100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1990,



\$100,000,000 in budget authority and \$100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1991, and \$100,000,000 in budget authority and \$100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1992.

(6) The Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs shall report (A) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (B) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, or (C) any combination thereof, as follows: \$0 in budget authority and \$1,100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1990, \$0 in budget authority and \$1,100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1991, and \$0 in budget authority and \$1,100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1992.

(7) The Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report (A) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, or (C) any combination thereof, as follows: \$445,000,000 in budget authority and \$678,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1990, \$445,000,000 in budget authority and \$678,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1991, and \$445,000,000 in budget authority and \$678,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1992.

(10)(A) The Senate Committee on Finance shall report (i) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (ii) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority other than as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, or (iii) any combination thereof, as follows: \$0 in budget authority and \$4,950,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1990, \$0 in budget authority and \$4,950,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1991, and \$0 in budget authority and \$4,950,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1992.

(B) The Senate Committee on Finance shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase revenues as follows: \$5,300,000,000 in fiscal year 1990, \$5,300,000,000 in fiscal year 1991, and \$5,300,000,000 in fiscal year 1992.

#### MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

##### NATIONAL COMMISSION ON MEDICARE REFORM

##### SEC. 5. SENSE OF CONGRESS

It is the sense of Congress that a bipartisan commission be established that would review the budgetary impact of accelerating Medicare payments and make recommendations to Congress and the President on how future Medicare reimbursements would match future financial resources. The commission would also examine how current

Medicare resources are being utilized and explore innovative solutions that would improve the efficiency of our nation's health care system. Medicare recipients must be assured that high quality health care will continue to be provided at a reasonable cost. Medicare payments are one of the fastest growing items in the budget and it is projected that within 15-20 years Medicare outlays will exceed outlays for Social Security. The commission, which would be appointed by the President, the Speaker of the House, and the Senate Majority Leader, would be given one year to make its recommendations for improving the operation of the Medicare program.

#### CONDUCT OF MONETARY POLICY

##### SEC. 6. SENSE OF CONGRESS

It is the sense of Congress that the Federal Reserve Board must maintain a consistent monetary policy that avoids historic patterns of rapid monetary growth followed by dramatic reductions in money supply in an effort to fine tune the economy. While Congress supports the Federal Reserve's efforts to fight inflation, Congress is also concerned that recent actions by the Federal Reserve to increase interest rates pose a potential threat to the longest peacetime economic recovery in our nation's history. Congress urges the Federal Reserve to once again make meeting their goals of monetary growth the main focus of their efforts to encourage maximum, sustainable economic growth.